DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 129 TM 030 741

TITLE	Texas Effectiveness Study: Interim Report, 1996-97.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Service Center Region XI, Fort Worth.
SPONS AGENCY	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE	2000-03-00
NOTE	76p.; For the adult outcome follow-up, see TM 030 740. Project Coordinator was Deborah Norris.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adults; Daily Living Skills; Educational Planning; Followup Studies; *High School Graduates; High Schools; *Outcomes of Education; Postsecondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Special Education; Tables (Data); *Transitional Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

This interim report summarizes the first-year findings and activities for the Adult Outcome Component of the Texas Effectiveness Study, implemented during the 1996-97 school year. The Adult Outcome component is one of three components of the Texas Effectiveness Study that will provide information about the outcomes of special education in Texas. The study gives a description of special education students who make the transition from school to adult life. The description begins with student records from the last year of high school, followed by information gathered from these students and their families about the transition to adult life. The adult outcome sample included 918 students from 41 school districts, from whom 842 record review survey instruments were returned. Follow-up information is to be obtained for these students through questionnaires. This information will be joined with that from the other two components of the Texas Effectiveness Study, the in-school component and the case study component, to give a more complete picture of special education outcomes in Texas. Appendixes contain the project timeline, summary statistics, the data collection instrument, and descriptions of community types. (Contains 37 tables.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 129

Texas Effectiveness Study

Interim Report 1996-1997

a project of Education Service Center Region XI

TM030741

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Deborah Norris

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Texas Effectiveness Study

Technical Report

1996-1997

Interim Report

Adult Outcome Component

Record Review

NOTE: The views contained herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the funding agency. No official endorsement by the Texas Education Agency should be inferred.

Texas Effectiveness Study
Technical Report
1996 – 1997

Education Service Center Region XI
3001 North Freeway
Fort Worth, Texas 76106

Acknowledgments

The project staff wish to thank the many people who have assisted with the this project referred to as the Texas Effectiveness Study. The cooperation of school personnel, the participants of this study, and their care givers have been invaluable and deeply appreciated. The efforts of the Texas Education Agency to investigate outcomes of students with disabilities will provide information to state and local agencies to improve programs and services.

Education Service Center Staff Region XI

Ray Chancellor, Ph.D.
Executive Director

Marie Morris, Ph.D.
Director of Instructional Services

Project Staff

Deborah Norris, M.S., C.R.C.
Project Coordinator

Gina Hoefer, M.S.
Assessment and Evaluation

Randall E. Schumacker, Ph.D.
University of North Texas
Project Consultant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Goals of the Texas Effectiveness Study 1

Project History and Future 1

Questions for Investigation 2

Overview of Recent Legislation 2

Three New Study Components 3

Methods and Procedures 3

Study Limitations 4

Sampling Procedures 4

Data Collection Instrument 4

Data Collection Procedures 5

Data Analysis 5

Preliminary Findings 5

Part I: Characteristics of the Adult Outcome Sample 6

Demographic Characteristics of the Adult Outcome Sample 6

Student's Life Skills 6

Educational Experience 8

Individual Transition Process 9

Transition Source and Services 9

Transition Planning Process 10

Relation between the ITP and IEP 11

Part II: Comparison by Demographics 13

Chi-square Explanation for Use in Data Analysis 13

High School Graduation Status 13

Student Expectations After Graduation 14

Instructional Arrangement and Outcomes 18

Transition Services Identified and Provided 20

Service Providers and IEP Completion 24

Part III: Status of the Texas Effectiveness Study 27

Appendices 29

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 .....Demographic Characteristics
Table 2 .....Students' Means of Graduating High School
Table 3 .....Student Expectations After Leaving High School
Table 4 .....Identified Services Students Need After Leaving High School
Table 5 .....Instructional Arrangement of Students in the Sample
Table 6 .....Study Area Concentration
Table 7 .....Number of Hours in Regular and Special Education Settings
Table 8 .....TAAS Performance as Recorded on the Record Review Survey
Table 9 .....Written ITP for the 1996-97 School Year
Table 10 .....Individuals Attending the Students' Last ITP Meeting
Table 11 .....Source of Transition Services
Table 12 .....Service Providers Invited to ITP Meetings
Table 13 .....Service Providers Attending ITP Meetings
Table 14 .....Outcome Areas Addressed on the 1996-1997 ITP's
Table 15 .....Transition Services Identified as Needs
Table 16 .....Transition Services Provided
Table 17 .....IEP Includes Annual Objectives Developed from the ITP
Table 18 .....Annual IEP Objectives Developed From the ITP
Table 19 .....Transition Services Addressed in the IEP
Table 20 .....Means of Exiting High School
Table 21 .....Student Expectations for Employment
Table 22 .....Student Expectations for Vocational Training
Table 23 .....Student Expectations for Post Secondary Education
Table 24 .....Student Expectations for Living Arrangements
Table 25 .....Student Expectations for Recreation/Leisure
Table 26 .....Student Instructional Arrangements
Table 27 .....TAAS Administration
Table 28 .....Career Counseling/School Guidance Transition Services Identified in High School
Table 29 .....Academic Instruction – Transition Services Identified in High School
Table 30 .....Career/Vocational Education Classes – Transition Services Identified in High School
Table 31 .....Career Counseling/School Guidance – Transition Services Provided in High School
Table 32 .....Academic Instruction – Transition Services Provided in High School
Table 33 .....Career/Vocational Education Classes – Transition Services Provided in High School
Table 34 .....Source of Transition Services by Primary Disability and Community Type
Table 35 .....Invited Service Providers for ITP Meetings by Primary Disability and Community Type
Table 36 .....Service Providers Attending ITP Meetings by Disability and Community Type
Table 37 .....Transition Services Addressed in the IEP

INTRODUCTION

This interim report summarizes the first year findings and activities for the Adult Outcome Component of the Texas Effectiveness Study, which was implemented during the 1996-1997 school year. The Adult Outcome Component is one of three components that will be implemented simultaneously as a continuation of the original series of effectiveness studies conducted by the Texas Education Agency.

The information presented in this report, as well as future interim reports, paints a picture of a small group of students who transition from public school to adult life. The framework for this picture starts by gathering information about the students' last year in high school by conducting a record review. This picture will take shape over the next several years as information is gathered from this group of former students and their families about their experiences as they transition into adult life. It is important to note that this information should not be generalized to represent each and every student who received or who is currently receiving special education services. This information may be useful to identify trends in the general population of students who receive special education services or to make comparisons of trends among target subpopulations.

Goals of the Texas Effectiveness Study

Goals of the Texas Effectiveness Study include the following:

- Investigate the employment, living conditions, leisure, and recreational experiences, as well as the postsecondary experiences of students exiting the public education system on a statewide basis.
- Develop a transition model and design a longitudinal study to investigate the relationships hypothesized in current models, using contrasting student profiles.
- Identify independent school districts representative of the diversity within Texas to participate in the study.
- Develop survey instruments responsive to the research questions of the study.
- Collect and analyze data using methods that maximize the validity and reliability of the results.
- Disseminate the results to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and other stakeholders and interested parties throughout the state in order to allow informed decisions about transition programming.
- Identify and disseminate information on best practices in transition planning and transition programming.
- Develop a guide for local follow-up or follow-along studies of the students who exit special education programs for the purpose of program evaluation, improvement, and accountability at the district level.

Project History and Future

The Texas Effectiveness Study (TES) project originated through the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in 1990, which conducted a series of interrelated studies from 1990 to 1996. Due to the decentralization of specific technical assistance functions of TEA in accordance with Rider 44 of Article III of the General Appropriations Act of 1995, the Education Service Center Region XI was identified to continue work on this project. The global purpose for conducting this study is to assess the overall effectiveness of special education in developing students' life skills, and particularly the transition process of the individual student as he progresses from school to adult life. The information collected will allow informed decisions to be made at the state and local level with regard to planning and providing an effective educational experience for students with disabilities in Texas' public schools that will lead to successful transitions to adult life.

Questions for Investigation

The following general questions were identified for investigation in the three planned components to be implemented over the next several years:

- What are the outcomes of students who received special education services during their secondary grades in public school in the areas of employment, postsecondary education, residential status, recreation and leisure, and social and interpersonal networks?
- What support systems exist in the community for these young adults?
- What are common experiences during high school of graduates who are distinguished by their level of success in the adult world?
- What are the relationships between the characteristics of the student, family, and community and the adult outcomes of former students of special education programs?
- What are the educational experiences of students who are currently receiving special education services at the secondary level of public school?
- How is transition planning accomplished for students with disabilities?
- What is the impact of transition planning on the educational experiences and adult outcomes of students served in special education programs?

Overview of Recent Legislation

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 made transition planning a requirement of the Individual Education Program (IEP) for students whom receive special education services in public schools. Individual transition planning and in Texas, the development of an Individual Transition Plan apart from the IEP, should be implemented by age 16. On June 4, 1997 President Clinton signed into law the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 (P.L. 105-17, IDEA) which further strengthened the focus of post-school outcomes and independent living for students with disabilities. A statement of needed transition services with a focus on the student's course of study must be included in the student's IEP by age 14. This provision was meant to enhance the separate transition requirement of including statements of transition service needs to be included in the IEP by age 16.

Other changes to IDEA that will impact transition services for youth with disabilities include the following: (a) adding related services to the five areas to be considered in planning the coordinated set of activities in the original definition of transition services (i.e., instruction, community experiences, employment, other post-school living objectives, and functional vocational evaluation); (b) increasing the required membership of the State Advisory Panel; (c) including students with disabilities in general state and district wide assessment programs; (d) removing transition requirements for youth with disabilities in adult correctional facilities; and (e) requiring notification of transfer of parental rights at the age of majority. As a result of the evolving federal and state legislation, as well as, research suggesting that transition planning is crucial to adult success, Texas implemented and continues to support a series of studies to investigate the effectiveness of special education and the effectiveness of the transition planning process. This support was given in order to anticipate and address transition needs of students, to facilitate a smooth emergence from school to adult life, and to address questions raised about the implementation of the "Memorandum of Understanding" on transition planning for students receiving special education services.[1]

[1] 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) 89.246, effective September 1990.

THREE NEW STUDY COMPONENTS

Identified to continue work on the effectiveness study project, the Education Service Center Region XI wrapped up data collection for year six of the original longitudinal and transition studies, analyzed the existing data, and disseminated the results and recommendations in a document titled Special Education Effectiveness Study Technical Report 1995-1996. In January of 1997, Education Service Center Region XI received approval from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to implement a proposal to expand the scope of the Special Education Effectiveness Study for several more years. Three new study components will be implemented simultaneously over the next several years according to the proposed timeline for the project (Appendix 1). Each component is briefly described in this document

Adult Outcome Component

The first component implemented during the 1996-1997 school year is presented in this report and is referred to as the **Adult Outcome Component**. During the summer of 1997 data was collected on a sample of students from across the state using a record review survey instrument. Information was retrieved from students' school records by district personnel and recorded onto the record review survey instrument. Using a longitudinal design, follow-up information will be collected directly from this sample of former students at scheduled intervals over the next several years.

The student criteria for inclusion in the Adult Outcome sample is as follows:

- must be eligible for special education services as defined by federal and state law
- must be currently enrolled in public school
- must be in the last year of high school
- must have an anticipated exit date from public school in the spring or summer of 1997, or
- must be in the graduating class of 1997.

A small comparison group of students representing the general education population using common variables such as gender, age, and ethnicity will be included at a later date.

In-School Component

The second of the three new components is referred to as the **In-School Component**. This component was implemented during the late spring and summer semesters of 1998. Subsequent reports will describe findings from data collected. The student criteria for inclusion in the In-School sample is as follows:

- must be eligible for special education services as defined by state and federal law
- must be currently enrolled in public school
- must be age 14 as of June 1, 1998.

Case Study Component

The last of the three components to be implemented is a **Case Study** content analysis of student records, interviews, and observation of a small sample of students identified from the larger In-School sample. Planning for the Case Study Component is underway and first-round student interviews were conducted during the 1998-1999 school year.

Methods and Procedures

Since the summer of 1997 the Education Service Center Region XI has implemented the Adult Outcome and the In-School components of the Texas Special Education Effectiveness Study. Education Service Center Region XI's responsibilities include creating the student sample for each component, identifying and/or designing survey instruments for collecting data at multiple points throughout the project, developing and maintaining district contacts, contracting with data collectors, analyzing data collected, and reporting written findings to the Texas Education Agency. Education Service Center Region XI also has the responsibility to maintain the confidentiality of students involved in each study component and to store all data collected in a secure location. Interim reports developed will be disseminated to all districts statewide, Education Service Centers, adult service agencies, colleges and universities, as well as other interested persons. The funding source for this project is IDEA-B discretionary.

Study Limitations

Limitations identified for the Adult Outcome Component during the initial phase of implementation include the following:

- During the sampling process districts were chosen statewide to represent the diversity of the state. Of those districts chosen there were a number that declined to participate in the study. There were also districts that dropped out before data collection activities began.
- The student sample was initially stratified according to primary disability and community type. Of those students chosen for the sample, a number declined participation in the study.
- Movement of students from one district to another, movement of students out of state, and students who dropped out of high school affected the sample size and distribution.
- The ability of school personnel to locate and retrieve information from student records may affect results. Information on missing data is not included in the summary statistics in Appendix 2.
- How data collectors interpreted questions on the survey instrument may affect results.

Sampling Procedures

Sampling of students for the Adult Outcome Component was conducted in two stages. School districts were first selected to represent the diversity of the state. Community type labels assigned to districts by TEA were used to stratify districts geographically and to reflect the population distribution of these communities. The eight community types assigned to districts include major urban, major suburban, other central city, central city suburban, independent town, non-metropolitan fast growing, non-metropolitan stable, and rural. The initial sample was then selected from participating districts using a stratified random sampling method based on primary disability. Due to small sample sizes in some of the eight community types, they were later collapsed into three general types. Superintendents of these districts were contacted by mail to provide consent for their district to participate in the study.

A list of student names from participating districts who met the criteria for the adult outcome component were provided to project staff from the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). Student names were alphabetized by district then by primary disability. The student sample was then selected from participating districts using a stratified random proportional sampling plan. The 14 disability categories identified in the PEIMS data set were then collapsed down to seven categories. The seven disability categories used were auditory impairment, visual impairment, mental retardation, emotional disability, learning disability, speech impairment, and other which include low incident disability categories. The number of students initially chosen from each district was proportional to the size of the district.

Students in the sample were assigned an obscure number so as to protect their identity. Student names and social security numbers were retained in a separate file to be used for future follow-up purposes. All information collected will remain in a secure location at the Education Service Center Region XI. The information will be destroyed when no longer needed for purposes of this project. A plan to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of each student chosen for the sample is on file at TEA with the PEIMS office.

The adult outcome sample includes 918 students from 41 public school districts in Texas. Of the 918 students identified in the sample 842 record review survey instruments were returned, which equates to a 92% return rate for the information collected.

Data Collection Instrument

A 65-item questionnaire was developed to gather information from each student's comprehensive and special education records. This record review provided demographic information about the student, the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and the Individualized Transition Plan (ITP). See Appendix 3 for a copy of the record review survey instrument.

A follow-up questionnaire has been developed to solicit student responses about post-school outcomes. The adult outcome questionnaire will be mailed directly to former students who choose to participate in the longitudinal phase of the study. Information from these former students will be gathered at planned intervals over the next four years. Types of information to be solicited from former students include information about living arrangements, post-secondary education and/or training, employment, and leisure/recreational activities.

Data Collection Procedures

At the time districts agreed to participate in the adult outcome component of the Effectiveness Study, the Superintendent or designee identified a district contact person. This person was then responsible for identifying data collector(s) for the district as well as to serve as a liaison between the student and his or her family and the ESC Region XI Project Coordinator. Written instructions for data collection were provided to each participating district along with a record review survey instrument to be filled out for each student in the district sample. Data collectors were directly paid $40.00 per survey for their services. ESC Region XI project staff were available for technical assistance to the districts and to the individuals collecting data.

Data Analysis

Data collected during the summer of 1997 record review for students exiting high school was coded and entered into SPSS statistical software package for data analysis. A summary report of the results will be forwarded to the Texas Education Agency. The report will be disseminated statewide to public school districts, adult service agencies, Regional Education Service Centers, and other interested parties upon request. Anyone who would like to receive a copy of interim reports on this project should contact:

Deborah Norris
Education Service Center Region XI
3001 North Freeway
Fort Worth, TX 76106
(817) 740-3619 e-mail dnorris@esc11.net.

Preliminary Findings

The findings presented in this report were analyzed in two ways. First, the data was summarized as an aggregate of all disability categories. Second, data was summarized by specific disability categories. Data was also summarized by community type labels and gender.

The descriptive tables and charts found in this report include frequencies and percentages. Missing data noted in tables and charts refer to data that was left blank on the survey instruments or information that was miscoded. Summary data found in Appendix 2 does not contain missing data percentages. The actual number of respondents to a particular question or prompt on the record review is indicated as "N".

The disability categories used for purposes of this project correspond to the disability codes found in the PEIMS data set. Only primary disabilities were identified for each student in the sample. Low incident disability categories were grouped together and labeled "other" for the purpose of sample selection and availability of project resources. The primary disability categories used in the study include auditory impairment, visual impairment, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, learning disability, speech impairment, and other consisting of orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, deaf/blind, autism, developmental delay, traumatic brain injury, non-categorical early childhood. The next section describes demographic characteristics of Adult Outcome sample.

PART I: Characteristics Of The Adult Outcome Sample

Demographic Characteristics of the Adult Outcome Sample

The Adult Outcome Component is designed to specifically examine life skills, educational experiences, and the individual transition process of former students who received special education services. The key demographic characteristics of the sample used in the analysis (gender, disability type, and community type) are presented in Table 1. More males than females, mostly urban rather than rural community types, and more than one-half of the students having learning disabilities characterized the sample.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics

Variable	N	%
Gender		
Male	543	64.5
Female	295	35.0
Missing	4	0.5
Community Type		
A	118	14.0
B	668	79.3
C	56	6.7
Primary Disability Categories		
Auditory	34	4.0
Visual	23	2.7
Mental Retardation	92	10.9
Emotional Disability	70	8.3
Learning Disability	477	56.7
Speech	21	2.5
Other	111	13.2
Missing	14	1.7

For the purposes of data analysis the 8 community type labels assigned to participating districts by TEA have been collapsed into three categories. Category "A" includes major urban and major suburban community types. Category "B" includes other central city, other central city suburban, and independent town community types. Category "C" includes non metro fast growing, non metro stable, and rural community types. Refer to Appendix 4 for a description of each community type.

Student's Life Skills

A student's status upon exiting high school is important in defining a starting point for improving student outcomes related to life skills. In addition, student expectations and the services a district has indicated that a student will need after leaving public school further delineates potential student outcomes. This section of the report will describe the sample of former students based on information from the Individual Education Plan (IEP), the Individual Transition Plan (ITP), and other student records. Table 2 presents the students' means of leaving high school. Regular graduation and/or completion of the IEP reflect a 79.6% high school completion rate compared to a small drop out rate (3.0%) and a no graduation rate (12.7%). Note that the "Q" recorded in each table refers to the specific question number on the data collection instrument which can be located in Appendix 3.

Table 2. Students' Means of Graduating High School (Q8)

Status	N	%
Regular Graduation	156	18.5
Completed IEP Requirements	515	61.1
Drop Out	26	3.1
Did Not Leave High School	107	12.7
Missing	38	4.5

Student expectations after high school graduation may indicate the potential for life skill development. Table 3 reflects a breakdown of student expectations by employment, vocational training, post-secondary education, and residential living areas. The summarization of information by area indicates that students have high expectations for competitive employment (63.4%), educational opportunities at colleges and universities (43.2%), independent living arrangement (56.1%), and independent recreation (66.0%) without any need for vocational training. The information in the record reviews indicated that these areas were addressed in the ITP's, with approximately 10% containing missing data.

Table 3. Student Expectations After Leaving High School (Q51-55)

Services	N	%
Employment		
Competitive	534	63.4
Supported	107	12.7
Sheltered	41	4.9
Vocational training	30	3.6
Other	44	5.2
Missing	86	10.2
Vocational Training		
Vocational Rehabilitation	171	20.3
JTPA	26	3.1
MHMR	55	6.5
Commission for the Blind	24	2.9
Other	223	26.5
Not addressed in the ITP	260	30.9
Missing	83	9.9
Postsecondary Education		
Junior/community college	273	32.5
4 year college/university	90	10.7
Business school	11	1.3
Technical school	114	13.5
Military training	31	3.7
Adult Basic Ed/GED	9	1.1
Other	199	23.6
Not addressed in the ITP	93	11.0
Missing	22	2.6
Long Term Living Arrangements		
Family	140	16.6
Alone/roommate-no support	472	56.1
Alone/roommate-w/support	34	4.0
Supervised living	59	7.0
Other	19	2.3
Not addressed in the ITP	38	4.5
Missing	80	9.5
Recreation/Leisure		
Community	50	5.9
Independent	556	66.0
Specialized programs	68	8.1
Day programs	21	2.5
Other	24	2.9
Not addressed in the ITP	45	5.3
Missing	78	9.3

Table 4. Identified Services Students Need After Leaving High School (Q46-50)

Services	Percent Selecting*
Employment	
Vocational assessment	14.6
Rehabilitation counseling	20.7
Career education class	26.1
Community work experience	24.5
Job placement	28.1
Ongoing employment support	23.9
Other	3.6
Postsecondary Education	
Study skills support	20.5
Academic coursework	31.0
Career counseling	26.5
Financial assistance	17.7
Transportation	14.1
Other	1.8
Recreation/Social	
Recreation/leisure services	17.3
Social supports	14.1
Other	1.7
Independent Living	
ILS** training	19.1
Residential services/supports	10.5
In-home family support	14.3
Respite care	2.4
Other	1.1
General Services	
Self-advocacy training	8.6
Income assistance	19.1
Transportation	20.4
Case management	12.0
Guardianship	9.0
Assistive/adaptive devices	7.6
Personal assistant	3.7
Financial services	10.9
Other	0.8

*Percent of n=842 indicating service needed
**Independent Living Skills

Participating districts indicated services the student would need after leaving high school on the record review survey form. Table 4 permits a further delineation of needed services in comparison to students' expectations. Districts indicated that job placement (28.1%), career education (26.1%), community work experience (24.5%), on-going employment support (23.9%), academic coursework (31.0%), career counseling (26.5%), recreation services (17.3%), social support (14.1%), independent living skills training (19.1%), in-home family support (14.3%), income assistance (19.1%) and transportation to work (20.4%) ranked the highest among the general service needs listed. The students' expectations and stated district service needs correspond.

Educational Experience

The educational experience in high school can indicate the ability of students to effectively make the most of transition services from school to adult life. As mentioned previously, 79.6 % had completed high school. The primary instructional arrangement in high school is listed in Table 5. Most students were either in a regular classroom, resource room, or in vocational adjustment class.

Table 5. Instructional Arrangement of Students in the Sample (Q9)

Instructional Arrangement	N	%
Regular classroom	205	24.8
Resource room	219	26.5
Self-contained classroom		
Mild/moderate/regular campus	66	8.0
Severe/Profound/regular campus	66	8.0
Separate classroom	25	3.0
Vocational adjustment class	172	20.8
Homebound	16	1.9
Miscellaneous**	21	2.5
Other	35	4.2

** Miscellaneous includes hospital class, nonpublic day school, residential care and treatment facility, state school, community class, Texas School for the Deaf, and Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired.

The study area concentration is also helpful in understanding the nature of the educational experience that students obtained in high school. Table 6 indicates the average percent of time spent in several different areas of instruction. The highest averages were for academics (45%) and vocational skills (13% and 12%, respectively). It should be noted that the percent of time varied considerably, as indicated by the large standard deviations.

Table 6. Study Area Concentration (Q13)

Study Area	Average Percent	Standard Deviation
Academics	45	32
Life Skills	8	20
General Vocational Skills	13	22
Occupational Exploration	4	13
Specific Vocational Skills	12	21
Physical Education	3	6
Arts	2	7
Disability Support Services	1	9
Other	11	26

Table 7. Number of Hours in Regular (Peers without disabilities) and Special (Peers with disabilities) Education Settings (Q10-11)

Educational Setting	N	%
Regular (Peers without disabilities)		
Less than 1 hour	184	21.9
1-5 hours	83	9.9
6-10 hours	65	7.7
11-15 hours	91	10.8
16-20 hours	49	5.8
21-25 hours	89	10.6
26-30 hours	255	30.3
Missing	26	3.1
Special (Peers with disabilities)		
Less than 1 hour	267	31.7
1-5 hours	150	17.8
6-10 hours	73	8.7
11-15 hours	82	9.7
16-20 hours	45	5.3
21-25 hours	47	5.6
26-30 hours	149	17.7
Missing	29	3.4

A further clarification of the educational experience is possible by examining the number of hours spent in both regular and special educational settings. This information is summarized in Table 7. No clear patterns emerge; rather, a number of differing hours are spent in both regular and special educational settings.

Table 8. TAAS Performance as Recorded on the Record Review Survey (Q19-21)

TAAS	N	%
Took TAAS test (n=793)	219	26.0
Passed TAAS Components		
Language (n=537)	222	41.3
Math (n=527)	170	32.3
Writing (n=537)	211	39.3
Test modifications (n=531)	46	8.7

The number taking the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) and mastering each of three areas (language, math, and writing) provides evidence of educational achievement. A small percent of students taking the TAAS required test modifications (8.7%). This information is summarized in Table 8.

Individual Transition Process

Several issues emerge related to the Individual Transition Plans for students receiving special education services. These will be presented in the following sections. First, does every student have an ITP and participate in transition planning? Second, what is the source of transition services and what related services were identified in the 1996-1997 IEP's? Thirdly, how is the transition planning process accomplished? Finally, does the IEP include annual objectives written from the ITP?

Transition Source and Services

From the data reported, only 84.0% of the total sample of students had an Individual Transition Plan for the 1996-1997 school year. Documentation recorded on the record review survey indicates that only 76.2% of the sample attended his or her ITP meeting. Tables 9 and 10 summarize this information.

Table 9. Written ITP for the 1996-1997 school year (Q38)

Written ITP	N	%
Total sample (n=842)		
Students with ITP 1996-1997	711	84.4

Table 10. Individuals attending the Students' Last ITP meeting (N=842) (Q43)

Individual	N	%
Student	642	76.2
Parent/Guardian	441	52.4
General Educ. Teacher	173	20.5
General Voc. Educ. Rep.	140	16.6
Special Educ. Teacher	630	74.8
Spec Voc. Educ. Rep	56	6.7
Diagnostician	375	44.5
Transition Coordinator	261	31.0
VAC	291	34.6
Supervisor/Administrator	381	45.2
Advocate	31	3.7
Adult Service Agency Rep	183	21.7
Other Service Provider	147	17.5

The source of transition services is mostly from public education or a combination of public education and community agency assistance (Table 11).

Table 11. Source of Transition Services (N = 842), according to the most current ITP (Q39)

Source	N	%
Public Education	454	53.9
Community Agency	102	12.1
Both	268	31.8
No Transition Services	58	6.9

Transition Planning Process

A majority of the students had written ITP's for the 1996-1997 school year (84.4%). Mostly home school district and Texas Rehabilitation Commission service providers were invited (Table 12) and attended (Table 13) ITP meetings.

Table 12. Service Providers Invited to ITP Meetings (N=842) (Q44)

Service Providers	N	%
Home School District	605	71.9
TX Rehab. Commission	404	48.0
TX Workforce Commission	41	4.9
TX Dept. of Health	20	2.4
TX Dept. of Human Services	32	3.8
TX Commission for Blind	16	1.9
TX Commission for Deaf	3	0.4
TX DPRS	27	3.2
TX MHMR	53	6.3
Local MR Center	43	5.1
Independent Living Center	4	0.5
JTPA	22	2.6
LWFDB	2	0.2
Other Adult Agency	43	5.1
Other Community Provider	43	5.1
Private Provider	12	1.4

Table 13. Service Providers Attending ITP Meetings (N=842) (Q45)

Service Providers	N	%
Home School District	616	73.2
TX Rehab. Commission.	196	23.3
TX Workforce Commission	24	2.9
TX Dept. of Health	1	0.1
TX Dept. of Human Services	1	0.1
TX Commission for Blind	17	2.0
TX Commission for Deaf	3	0.4
TX DPRS	13	1.5
TX MHMR	34	4.0
Local MR Center	17	2.0
Independent Living Center	1	0.1
JTPA	13	1.5
LWFDB	1	0.1
Other Adult Agency	15	1.8
Other Community Provider	35	4.2
Private Provider	3	0.4

The record review survey gathered information on outcome areas addressed on the student's 1996-1997 ITP. Outcome areas addressed on the ITP's are in Table 14. All areas were significantly addressed. These outcome areas also related to students' expectations and the services districts indicated students' will need.

Table 14. Outcome Areas Addressed on the 1996-1997 Tip's (Q40)

Outcome Area	N	%
Post Secondary	649	77.1
Employment	685	81.4
Recreation	630	74.8
Independent Living	632	75.1
General (income, medical)	563	66.9
Adult Education	372	44.2
Other	82	9.7

Information was gathered on transition services that were identified as needs and provided according to the students' 1996-1997 ITP. Academic instruction, vocational education classes, and career counseling were the highest ranked needs. Academic Instruction, Vocational Education Classes, Career Counseling, and Community Based Training were the most often provided. Tables 15 and 16 summarize identified service needs as well as services provided to students according to the ITP.

Table 15. Transition Services Identified as needs on the ITP (N=842) (Q41)

Identified Needs	N	%
Vocational Assessment	171	20.3
Career Counseling	333	39.5
Rehabilitation Counseling	142	16.9
Vocational Education Classes	402	47.7
Community Based Training	258	30.6
Job Placement	242	28.7
Ongoing Employment Support	217	25.8
Academic Instruction	555	65.9
Independent Living	271	32.2
Self Advocacy Training	98	11.6
Social Skills Training	113	13.4
Income Assistance	145	17.2
Residential Support Services	73	8.7
Transportation	228	27.1
Case Management	81	9.6
Guardianship	77	9.1
Medical Assistance	77	9.1
Assistive/Adaptive	48	5.7
Attendant Services	18	2.1
Financial Planning	71	8.4
Individual-Family Support	120	14.3
Other	53	6.3

Table 16. Transition Services Provided According to ITP (N=842) (Q42)

Service Provided	N	%
Vocational Assessment	149	17.7
Career Counseling	358	42.5
Rehabilitation Counseling	101	12.0
Vocational Education Classes	387	46.0
Community Based Training	242	28.7
Job Placement	179	21.3
Ongoing Employment Support	197	23.4
Academic Instruction	581	69.0
Independent Living	202	24.0
Self Advocacy Training	91	10.8
Social skills Training	135	16.0
Income Assistance	86	10.2
Residential Support Services	33	3.9
Transportation	178	21.1
Case Management	85	10.1
Guardianship	40	4.8
Medical Assistance	52	6.2
Assistive/Adaptive	46	5.5
Attendant Services	9	1.1
Financial Planning	46	5.5
Individual-Family Support	97	11.5
Other	37	4.4

Relation between the ITP and IEP

Does the IEP include annual objectives developed from the ITP? Over two-thirds of the record reviews indicated they did, while only 119 definitely indicated no.

Table 17. IEP Includes Annual Objectives Developed From the ITP (N=842) (Q28)

IEP has ITP Objectives	N	%
Yes	588	69.8
No	119	14.1
Don't Know	28	3.3
Not Applicable	12	1.4
Missing	95	11.3

The following transition planning areas were represented in the IEP (Table 18). Employment, post secondary education, and independent living were most often included.

Table 18. Annual IEP Objectives Developed From the ITP in the Following Areas. (Q29)

ITP Areas	N	%
Post Secondary	398	47.3
Employment	497	59.0
Recreation-Leisure	265	31.5
Independent Living	313	37.2
General (income, medical)	227	27.0
ITP-Other	76	9.0

Transition services that were addressed on the students' most current IEP are shown in Table 19. Practical services related to instruction, employment, and post school living objectives were covered. These services are comparable to those identified, addressed, and provided earlier. It should be noted that transition services do not need to be implemented as formal objectives. Transition services may be implemented through indirect services.

Table 19. Transition services addressed in IEP (N=842) (Q30)

Transition Service	N	%
Instruction	672	79.8
Community Experiences	389	46.2
Employment	538	63.9
Post School Living Objectives	398	47.3
Daily Living Skills	311	36.9
Vocational Evaluation	222	26.4
Transition Services-Other	39	4.6

PART II: Comparison by Demographics

The previous aggregate analysis of students' life skills, educational experience, and the transition process indicated that student expectations, district perceived needs, and services were similar and centered around instruction, employment, and post school living objectives. This section therefore specifically looks at these areas to determine if differences existed by gender, primary disability, and community type.

Chi-square Explanation for Use in Data Analysis

A chi-square statistic is reported in Tables 20-33. Like many statistics, the chi-square is used when one wishes to make statements about a large population of people based upon a sample of that population, chosen in a scientifically random manner. The chi-square is the appropriate statistic to use when dealing with counts of individuals or things in mutually exclusive categories, rather than the means of two or more groups measured on one or more variables.

In this study, the chi-square is used to test the null hypothesis that student characteristics have no relationship to educational outcomes experienced by those students. The student characteristics considered are gender, disability type, and the type of community in which a student lives. The educational outcomes reported or observed are graduation status, instruction, counseling and transitional services received, testing experiences, and student expectations for the future concerning employment, post-secondary education and training, living arrangements, and leisure time.

A chi-square value and degrees of freedom (not explained in this report) are looked up in the chi-square distribution table, which yields the significance level, or p value associated with that chi-square value. The p value tells us how probable it is that we would obtain a given chi-square value if the null hypothesis is true, or the relationship we are testing for does not exist.

Using Table 20 as an example, suppose we want to find out if males in special education are likely to end up with a different graduation status than females. A p value of .19 tells us that if we drew many samples from the same population, we would obtain a chi-square at least as large as 3.24 in 19 out of every 100 samples. In this case, we would retain the null hypothesis that there is no difference in graduation rates for males and females in the population because the chi-square is not statistically significant.

However, again using Table 20, suppose we want to determine if students with different types of disabilities are likely to end up with a different graduation status. Here the p value is .001. This means that the chi-square value would be at least as large as 94.2 in only one out of a thousand samples from this population. In other words, the differences we observe indicate a significant relationship between disability type and graduation status. In this case, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative that disability type has an effect on graduation status because the chi-square is statistically significant.

Researchers and decision makers must choose what p value represents significant results, based upon the harm that would be done by claiming a relationship when there is not truly one present. In social sciences, a p of .05 is often used to reject the null hypothesis and claim a significant relationship.

High School Graduation Status

A student's status upon exiting high school was examined by gender, disability type, and community type to reveal any discrepancies. Table 20 indicated no gender difference between those students who graduated and those who did not, a significant difference in graduation/no graduation rates by disability type, and no differences in graduation/no graduation rates by community type. According to disability type, students with learning disabilities mostly accomplished high school graduation by some form of IEP completion.

Table 20. Means of Exiting High School

	Regular Graduation		IEP Completion		No Graduation		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							3.24	2	.19
Male	98	12.2	326	40.6	95	11.8			
Female	58	7.2	188	23.4	38	4.7			
Disability Type							94.2	12	.001
Auditory	4	0.5	25	3.1	4	0.5			
Visual	10	1.2	4	0.5	8	1.0			
Mental Retardation	0	0	61	7.6	28	3.5			
Emotional Disability	12	1.5	38	4.7	17	2.1			
Learning Disability	96	12.0	331	41.2	43	5.4			
Speech	6	0.7	7	0.9	3	0.4			
Other	27	3.4	49	6.1	30	3.7			
Community Type							5.8	4	.21
A	79	9.9	234	29.2	74	9.2			
B	70	8.7	256	31.9	55	6.9			
C	7	0.9	24	3.0	3	0.4			

Student Expectations After Graduation

Students' expectation after graduation for employment, vocational training, post-secondary education, living arrangement, and recreation/ leisure is depicted by gender, disability type, and community type in Tables 21 to 25, respectively. A chi-square statistic was reported because of the categorical levels of the variables. The cross-tabulation of variables indicates independence or dependence of columns, rows and cells. Significant chi-square values ($p > .05$) indicate that at least one category (column, row, or cell) is significantly different from the others. Table 21 indicates that learning disabled students in predominantly urban and central cities expect to seek competitive employment with no difference in expectations between boys and girls. Table 22 indicates a discrepancy in whether vocational training was addressed in the ITP by gender, disability type, and community type. Gender and disability type differences were detected for post-secondary education expectations in Table 23. Basically, college/university education was expected rather than technical training or adult education. Table 24 indicates no gender differences in expected living arrangements, but clearly suggests living alone was expected across disability type and community type, rather than family or supported arrangements. Table 25 indicates that independent recreation was expected rather than community or non-independent activity. There were significant differences for primary disability and community type with regard to student expectations for recreation/leisure activities.

Table 23. Student Expectation for Post-Secondary Education

	College or University		Technical Training		Adult Education/ Other		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							16.4	2	0.001
Male	214	26.1	121	14.8	198	24.2			
Female	148	18.1	35	4.3	103	12.6			
Disability Type							152.6	12	0.000
Auditory	12	1.5	8	1.0	14	1.7			
Visual	12	1.5	3	0.4	8	1.0			
Mental Retardation	9	1.1	7	0.9	75	9.2			
Emotional Disability	32	3.9	14	1.7	23	2.8			
Learning Disability	257	31.4	109	13.3	106	12.9			
Speech	4	0.5	2	0.2	15	1.8			
Other	36	4.4	13	1.6	60	7.3			
Community Type							2.6	4	0.634
A	185	22.6	69	8.4	144	17.6			
B	162	19.8	79	9.7	145	17.7			
C	15	1.8	8	1.0	11	1.3			

Table 24. Student Expectation for Living Arrangement

	Family		Live Alone/ W/Roommates No Support		Supported Living		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							2.8	2	0.243
Male	83	10.9	316	41.5	94	12.4			
Female	56	7.4	156	20.5	56	7.4			
Disability Type							163.0	12	0.000
Auditory	8	1.1	15	2.0	6	0.8			
Visual	3	0.4	13	1.7	6	0.8			
Mental retardation	35	4.6	9	1.2	45	5.9			
Emotional Disability	10	1.3	42	5.5	13	1.7			
Learning Disability	54	7.1	346	45.5	54	7.1			
Speech	0	0	7	0.9	3	0.4			
Other	29	3.8	40	5.3	23	3.0			
Community Type							15.5	4	0.004
A	72	9.5	229	30.1	70	9.2			
B	54	7.1	229	30.1	73	9.6			
C	14	1.8	13	1.7	7	0.9			

Table 25. Student Expectation for Recreation/Leisure

	Community		Independent		Non-Independent/ Other		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							8.9	2	0.012
Male	41	5.4	360	47.2	93	12.2			
Female	9	1.2	195	25.6	65	8.5			
Disability Type							174.9	12	0.000
Auditory	3	0.4	17	2.2	10	1.3			
Visual	2	0.3	14	1.8	7	0.9			
Mental Retardation	15	2.0	23	3.0	51	6.7			
Emotional Disability	3	0.4	55	7.2	7	0.9			
Learning Disability	21	2.8	389	51.0	43	5.6			
Speech	0	0	9	1.2	2	0.3			
Other	5	0.7	49	6.4	38	5.0			
Community Type							17.7	4	0.001
A	30	3.9	254	33.3	89	11.7			
B	19	2.5	281	36.8	56	7.3			
C	1	0.1	20	2.6	13	1.7			

Instructional Arrangement and Outcomes

Tables 26 and 27 reflect instructional arrangements and outcomes. Most disability types and community types reflected regular classroom, resource room, or vocational adjustment instructional arrangements. No gender differences were noted for instructional arrangements. Table 27 indicates that no difference existed for gender and community type in taking the TAAS exam. The chi-square significance for disability type can be attributed to the large number of students with learning disabilities that did not take the TAAS. Overall, students did not take the TAAS. As reported before, most used some form of IEP completion to meet state graduation requirements.

Table 27. TAAS Administration

	Yes		No		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%			
Gender					0.24	1	0.622
Male	140	17.7	377	47.6			
Female	79	10.0	196	24.7			
Disability Type					46.22	6	0.000
Auditory	4	0.5	27	3.4			
Visual	8	1.0	15	1.9			
Mental Retardation	0	0	91	11.5			
Emotional Disability	19	2.4	49	6.2			
Learning Disability	153	19.3	311	39.3			
Speech	5	0.6	8	1.0			
Other	29	3.7	73	9.2			
Community Type					2.22	2	0.328
A	99	12.5	284	35.9			
B	112	14.2	263	33.2			
C	7	0.9	26	3.3			

Transition Services Identified and Provided

Certain types of transition services were previously identified and provided to students. The three most noted types were career counseling, academic instruction, and vocational classes/training. Consequently, this section will examine these three types for differences by gender, disability type, and community type according to services identified and provided to students. Table 28 indicates no gender difference in whether counseling services were given, but it is clear that a greater number did not receive counseling services across disability and community types. Tables 29 and 30 indicated similar findings for academic instruction and career/vocational training, respectively. Tables 31, 32, and 33 reflect whether the three types (career counseling, academic instruction, and vocational classes/training) were provided, respectively. Results are similar to those found for identified transition services in Tables 28, 29, and 30.

Table 28. Career Counseling/School Guidance - Transition Services Identified in High School

	Yes		No		Don't Know		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							3.67	2	0.159
Male	215	28.0	261	34.0	67	2.7			
Female	118	15.4	133	17.3	44	2.6			
Disability Type							25.52	12	0.013
Auditory	15	2.0	13	1.7	6	0.4			
Visual	14	1.8	9	1.2	0	0			
Mental Retardation	25	3.3	56	7.3	11	1.0			
Emotional Disability	31	4.0	29	3.8	10	0.4			
Learning Disability	207	27.0	233	30.3	37	2.1			
Speech	4	0.5	6	0.8	11	0.3			
Other	37	4.8	48	6.3	26	1.2			
Community Type							19.29	4	0.001
A	176	22.9	170	22.1	59	3.5			
B	138	18.0	213	27.7	47	1.4			
C	18	2.3	12	1.6	4	0.4			

Table 29. Academic Instruction - Transition Services Identified in High School

	Yes		No		Don't Know		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							2.38	2	0.305
Male	358	46.9	119	15.6	66	2.2			
Female	196	25.7	58	7.6	41	2.0			
Disability Type							17.49	12	0.132
Auditory	24	3.1	4	0.5	6	0.4			
Visual	17	2.2	6	0.8	0	0			
Mental Retardation	57	7.5	26	3.4	9	0.5			
Emotional Disability	47	6.2	14	1.8	9	0.4			
Learning Disability	335	43.9	106	13.9	36	1.7			
Speech	9	1.2	1	0.1	11	0.3			
Other	65	8.5	20	2.6	26	0.9			
Community Type							12.59	4	0.013
A	249	32.6	99	13.0	22	2.9			
B	279	36.6	72	9.4	10	1.3			
C	26	3.4	6	0.8	0	0			

Table 30. Career/Vocational Education Classes – Transition Services Identified in High School

	Yes		No		Don't Know		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							1.64	2	0.441
Male	263	34.5	214	28.0	66	2.4			
Female	138	18.1	115	15.1	42	2.0			
Disability Type							30.50	12	0.002
Auditory	19	2.5	8	1.0	7	0.5			
Visual	8	1.0	15	2.0	0	0			
Mental Retardation	47	6.2	37	4.8	8	0.5			
Emotional Disability	39	5.1	22	2.9	9	0.4			
Learning Disability	243	31.8	198	26.0	36	1.6			
Speech	7	0.9	3	0.4	11	0.3			
Other	38	5.0	46	6.0	27	1.0			
Community Type							19.48	4	0.001
A	174	22.8	174	22.8	22	2.9			
B	200	26.2	149	19.5	11	1.4			
C	27	3.5	6	0.8	0	0			

Table 31. Career Counseling/School Guidance - Transition Services Provided in High School

	Yes		No		Don't Know		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							0.069	2	0.966
Male	232	30.4	223	29.2	38	5.0			
Female	125	16.4	123	16.1	22	2.9			
Disability Type							15.83	12	0.199
Auditory	17	2.2	11	1.4	3	0.4			
Visual	13	1.7	9	1.2	1	0.1			
Mental Retardation	34	4.5	46	6.0	9	1.2			
Emotional Disability	34	4.5	24	3.1	6	0.8			
Learning Disability	221	29.0	203	26.6	27	3.5			
Speech	4	0.5	6	0.8	2	0.3			
Other	35	4.6	46	6.0	12	1.6			
Community Type							46.96	4	0.000
A	185	24.2	135	17.7	49	6.4			
B	152	19.9	201	26.3	10	1.3			
C	20	2.6	10	1.3	1	0.1			

Table 32. Academic Instruction - Transition Services Provided in High School

	Yes		No		Don't Know		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							0.54	2	0.763
Male	373	49.0	94	12.3	28	3.7			
Female	207	27.2	45	5.9	43	2.0			
Disability Type							11.26	12	0.507
Auditory	23	3.0	6	0.8	2	0.3			
Visual	21	2.8	2	0.3	0	0			
Mental Retardation	66	8.7	18	2.4	5	0.7			
Emotional Disability	48	6.3	11	1.4	5	0.7			
Learning Disability	350	45.9	83	10.9	20	2.6			
Speech	8	1.0	2	0.3	2	0.3			
Other	65	8.5	17	2.2	9	1.2			
Community Type							32.46	4	0.000
A	255	33.5	79	10.4	36	4.7			
B	294	38.6	58	7.6	7	0.9			
C	31	4.1	2	0.3	0	0			

Table 33. Career/Vocational Education Classes - Provided

	Yes		No		Don't Know		x^2	df	p
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Gender							0.56	2	0.768
Male	256	33.8	204	26.9	32	4.2			
Female	131	17.3	116	15.3	19	2.6			
Disability Type							27.42	12	0.007
Auditory	17	2.2	11	1.4	3	0.4			
Visual	6	0.8	17	2.2	0	0			
Mental Retardation	47	6.2	35	4.6	6	0.8			
Emotional Disability	39	5.1	20	2.6	5	0.7			
Learning Disability	236	31.1	188	24.8	25	3.3			
Speech	8	1.1	2	0.3	2	0.3			
Other	34	4.5	48	6.3	10	1.3			
Community Type							27.79	4	0.000
A	163	21.5	164	21.6	40	5.3			
B	206	27.2	146	19.3	8	1.1			
C	17	2.2	11	1.5	6	0.4			

Service Providers and IEP Completion

Traditionally community agencies (service providers) do not become involved in transition services until after graduation. It is important therefore to initially determine who is invited and attending transition service planning meetings. Only four service providers are indicated because they were previously reported as overall being the most invited and attended. It is also important to determine if transition services were addressed in the students' IEP's. This section, therefore specifically looks at differences in these areas by disability and community type. Table 34 indicates that regardless of disability type or community type, most services were provided by public education or a combination of both public education and community agency.

Table 35 indicates that Home School District and Texas Rehabilitation Commission were the most invited service providers to ITP meetings. Table 36 reflects that these two service providers were also the most attending. Again, this makes sense because many of the agencies listed on the school record review survey become involved after a student graduates.

Table 37 indicates that all of the transition services were addressed across the disability and community types.

Table 34. Source of Transition Services by Primary Disability and Community Type

	Public	Community	Both	None
Disability Type				
Auditory	17	12	14	0
Visual	10	3	12	2
Mental Retardation	39	17	43	4
Emotional Disability	42	8	17	6
Learning Disability	290	48	150	39
Speech	7	0	2	1
Other	49	14	29	6
Community Type				
A	213	66	130	34
B	221	31	132	23
C	19	5	6	1

Table 35. Invited Service Providers for ITP Meetings by Primary Disability and Community Type

	HSD	TRC	TWC	MHMR
Disability Type				
Auditory	26	17	0	0
Visual	18	8	0	2
Mental Retardation	77	43	2	21
Emotional Disability	48	30	2	7
Learning Disability	355	259	31	15
Speech	8	4	1	1
Other	73	42	5	7
Community Type				
A	267	153	6	21
B	311	224	30	27
C	26	27	5	5

HSD = Home School District

TRC = Texas Rehabilitation Commission

TWC = Texas WorkForce Commission

MHMR= Texas Mental Health and Mental Retardation

Table 36. Service Providers Attending ITP Meetings By Disability and Community Type

	HSD	TRC	TWC	MHMR
Disability Type				
Auditory	26	9	0	0
Visual	19	4	0	2
Mental Retardation	78	17	0	14
Emotional Disability	49	15	2	3
Learning Disability	359	126	18	7
Speech	8	5	2	2
Other	76	20	2	6
Community Type				
A	278	79	0	8
B	309	104	23	26
C	28	13	1	0

HSD = Home School District

TRC = Texas Rehabilitation Commission

TWC = Texas WorkForce Commission

MHMR= Texas Mental Health and Mental Retardation

Table 37. Transition Services Addressed in the IEP

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Disability Type						
Auditory	27	12	21	13	13	8
Visual	21	14	10	14	15	6
Mental Retardation	79	68	77	68	72	40
Emotional Disability	55	30	45	30	21	16
Learning Disability	397	205	310	216	144	121
Speech	10	5	9	4	2	2
Other	83	55	66	53	44	29
Community Type						
A	298	149	235	144	128	74
B	349	230	286	242	172	139
C	24	9	16	11	11	9

A = Instruction
B = Community Experience
C = Employment
D = Post-School Living Objectives
E = Daily Living Skills
F = Vocational Evaluation

PART III: Status of the Texas Effectiveness Study

This section summarizes the implementation and completion of data gathering activities for all three components of the Texas Effectiveness Study. Future interim reports will include an analysis of the data collected.

Adult Outcome Component

In addition to the record review that was conducted the summer of 1997, a follow-up survey was mailed to study participants during the spring semester of 1999. A second mailing was completed during the summer of 1999. Phone call follow-up is currently being conducted with the former students who did not return the survey by mail. Preliminary data is available at this time.

Over the next several years, a follow-up survey will be mailed to each student for the purpose of gathering information about his or her transition to life after high school. The survey is designed to collect information about the former students' satisfaction regarding how high school prepared them for adult life. Information will be collected on college or training since leaving high school, adult living skills utilized, employment information, recreation/leisure activities he or she is involved in, and expectations for the future.

In-School Component

District personnel conducted a record review during the spring and summer months of 1998 on students included in the In-School sample of the Texas Effectiveness Study. The record review will be conducted every other year until the student leaves high school. Along with the record review a number of other instruments were utilized to collect information about each student. The following list of data gathering tools was utilized with the permission of each student's parent/guardian.

- Transition Planning Inventory (TPI) - Information gathered using this tool will identify student perceptions of their current ability to perform skills needed in adult life. The teacher and student forms of the TPI were utilized. This tool will be administered once more before each student leaves high school.

- ARC's Self Determination Scale -This tool is used to gather information about each student's involvement in planning for life after high school. This tool is designed to be completed by the student. This tool will be administered once more before each student leaves high school.

- Teacher Survey - This survey is designed to gather information about each student's involvement in transition experiences and transition planning activities. This survey will be administered every other year until the student leaves high school.

The following data gathering tools are planned for future use to continue to gather information on each student's educational experience.

- Student Survey - This survey is designed to gather information about student knowledge of the transition process. This survey will be administered at age 16 and every other year after until the student leaves high school.

- Parent Survey – This survey is designed to gather information pertaining to the parent/guardian knowledge of transition planning as well as information about family involvement in transition planning. This survey will be administered every other year until the student leaves high school.

Case Study Component

Student interviews were conducted on a small sample of the larger In-School sample of students whose parent/guardian consented to participation in the study. These interviews were conducted during the spring of 1999. The questions asked pertain to self-determination and student involvement in the transition process. A second round of interviews will be conducted during the fall semester 1999 and then yearly thereafter.

For more information about the Texas Effectiveness Study contact:

Deborah Norris, M.S., CRC
Project Coordinator
Texas Effectiveness Study
Education Service Center Region XI
3001 North Freeway
Fort Worth, TX 76179
(817) 740-3619
dnorris@esc11.net

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 **Project Timeline**

Appendix 2 **Summary Stats**

Appendix 3 **Data Collection Instrument**

Appendix 4 **Community Type Descriptions**

Appendix 1: Project Timeline

Texas Effectiveness Study
Proposed Timeline
School Years 1997-2003

Summer 1997	Spring 1998	Winter 1999	Winter 2000	Winter 2001	Winter 2002	Winter 2003
IN-SCHOOL Component						
	✓ Initial Record Review ✓ TPI ✓ SDS ✓ Teacher survey	✓ Parent survey ✓ Student survey	✓ Record Review ✓ Students survey		✓ Record Review ✓ Student survey ✓ Teacher Survey ✓ Parent Survey	✓ Final Record Review ✓ TPI ✓ SDS ✓ Teacher survey ✓ Student survey ✓ Parent survey
ADULT OUTCOME Component						
✓ Record Review during the last year of H.S.	✓ Adult Outcome survey	✓ Adult Outcome survey	✓ Postcard Follow-up	✓ Adult Outcome survey	✓ Postcard Follow-up	✓ Adult outcome survey
✓ HS Graduate Nondisabled		✓ HS Graduate Nondisabled		✓ HS Graduate Nondisabled		✓ HS Graduate Nondisabled

Appendix 2: Summary Stats

Appendix 2
Raw Data for Adult Outcome Record Review

Q1. Total years student received special education services (N=821)

Minimum	1 year
Maximum	20 years
Mean	8.53 years

Q2. Ethnicity (N=811)

Asian	1.1%
Black	21.3%
Hispanic	25.3%
White	48.7%

Q3. Primary Disability (N=828)

Auditory Impairment	4.1%
Visual Impairment	2.8%
Mental Retardation	11.1%
Emotional Disability	8.5%
Learning Disability	57.6%
Speech Impairment	2.5%
Other	13.3%

Q4. If MR, level of disability (N=122)

Mild	38.5%
Moderate	35.2%
Severe	15.6%
Profound	10.7%

Q5. Absentee information

1993-1994 (N=439)	Mean = 8.5 days
1994-1995 (N=449)	Mean = 9.2 days
1995-1996 (N=450)	Mean = 10.2 days
1996-1997 (N=478)	Mean = 10.7 days

Q6. Eligibility for free meals (N=750)

Free meals	27.3%
Reduced priced meals	2.9%
Other economic disadvantaged	1.9%
Not identified as economically disadvantaged	67.9%

Q7. Primary means of communication (N=818)

English	91.0%
Spanish	2.8%
Vietnamese	0.2%
Sign Language	2.4%
Nonverbal-adaptive	0.7%
Nonverbal	2.1%
Other	0.7%

Q8. Means of exiting high school (N=804)

Regular graduation	19.4%
Completion of IEP requirements	64.0%
Drop-out	3.2%
Did not graduate during 1996-1997	13.3%

Q9. Primary instructional arrangement 1996-1997 (N=825)

Regular classroom	24.8%
Resource room/service	6.5%
Self-contained, mild/moderate, regular campus	8.0%
Self-contained, severe/profound, regular campus	8.0%
Self-contained, separate classroom	3.0%
Vocational Adjustment Class	20.8%
Homebound	1.9%
Hospital Class	0.4%
Nonpublic day school	1.1%
Residential care and treatment facility	0.7%
State School (ICF-MR)	0.1%
Community class	0.2%
Other	4.2%

Q10. Number of hours per week in regular educational settings (N=816)

Less than one hour per week	22.5%
1-5 hours per week	10.2%
6-10 hours per week	8.0%
11-15 hours per week	11.2%
16-20 hours per week	6.0%
21-25 hours per week	10.9%
26-30 hours per week	31.3%

Q11. Number of hours per week in special educational settings (N=813)

Less than one hour per week	32.8%
1-5 hours per week	18.5%
6-10 hours per week	9.0%
11-15 hours per week	10.1%
16-20 hours per week	5.5%
21-25 hours per week	5.8%
26-30 hours per week	17.7%

Q12. Percent of school day engaged in

School-based work experience (N=805)
Mean = 13.8% of day (approximately 50 minutes)

Community based work experience (N=805)
Mean = 16.9% of day (approximately 61 minutes)

Q13. Percent of day spent in study areas (Not analyzed)

Q14. Date of last IQ assessment (Not analyzed)

Q15. Name of IQ test administered (N=784)

WISC-R	10.5%
WAIS-R	20.9%
Kaufman ABC	1.8%
Stanford-Binet	4.2%
TONI	38.8%
Other	24.4%

Q16. Most recent IQ scores

Verbal	(N=816)	reported min = 1	reported max = 139	Mean = 42.5
Performance	(N=542)	reported min = 4	reported max = 144	Mean = 85.1
Full scale	(N=561)	reported min = 1	reported max = 136	Mean = 80.5

Q17. Development scale administered (Not analyzed)

Q18. Developmental Quotient (Not analyzed)

Q19. Took TAAS test during last administration (N=793)

Yes	27.6%
No	72.4%

Q20. TAAS components passed

Language Arts (N=537)	
Yes	41.3%
No	27.9%
Not Applicable	30.7%
Mathematics (N=527)	
Yes	32.3%
No	34.0%
Not Applicable	33.8%
Writing (N=537)	
Yes	39.3%
No	29.4%
Not Applicable	31.3%

Q21. TAAS modifications required (N=531)

Yes	8.7%
No	60.1%
Not applicable	31.3%

Q22. Alternative assessment (N=842) (Information provided upon request)

Q23. Achievement tests administered (N=842) (Information provided upon request)

Q24. Vocational assessment(s) administered (N=842) (Information provided upon request)

Q25. Recommendations from vocational assessment(s)

Enrollment in Specific Instructional Area (N=705)	
Yes	26.4%
No	66.7%
Not Applicable	7.0%

Enrollment in Specific Vocational Program (N=722)	
Yes	36.0%
No	57.2%
Not Applicable	6.8%

Development of IEP objectives (N=717)	
Yes	49.8%
No	43.4%
Not Applicable	6.8%

Q26. Family member who attended the last ARD meeting (N=799)

Mother	45.3%
Father	9.0%
Both parents	5.0%
Foster parents or other guardian	1.4%
Surrogate parent	0.4%
No one from the family attended	35.5%
Other	3.4%

Q27. Student attended the last ARD meeting (N=788)

Yes	83.9%
No	16.1%

Q28. Student's IEP included annual objectives developed from ITP (N=747)

Yes	78.7%
No	15.9%
Don't know	3.7%
Not applicable	1.6%

Q29. Student's IEP includes annual objectives developed from the ITP in the following areas

Post-secondary education (N=783)		Employment (N=789)	
Yes	50.8%	Yes	63.0%
No	42.9%	No	31.3%
Don't know	4.5%	Don't know	4.1%
Not applicable	1.8%	Not applicable	1.8%

Recreation/Social/Leisure (N=781)		Independent Living (N=826)	
Yes	33.9%	Yes	37.9%
No	59.9%	No	51.8%
Don't know	4.4%	Don't know	3.4%
Not applicable	1.8%	Not applicable	1.8%

General Considerations (N=782)		Other Considerations (N=590)	
Yes	29.0%	Yes	12.9%
No	64.6%	No	71.2%
Don't know	4.5%	Don't know	12.9%
Not applicable	1.9%	Not applicable	3.1%

Q30. Transition services addressed in the most current IEP

Instruction (N=796)		Employment (N=796)	
Yes	84.4%	Yes	67.6%
No	11.7%	No	28.1%
Don't know	2.3%	Don't know	2.6%
Not applicable	1.6%	Not applicable	1.6%

Community experiences (N=792)		Post-school adult living objectives (N=793)	
Yes	49.1%	Yes	50.2%
No	45.5%	No	45.1%
Don't know	3.8%	Don't know	3.0%
Not applicable	1.6%	Not applicable	1.6%

Daily living skills (N=775)	
Yes	40.1%
No	50.3%
Don't know	3.9%
Not applicable	5.7%

Functional vocational evaluation (N=783)	
Yes	28.4%
No	64.0%
Don't know	4.3%
Not applicable	3.3%

Other transition services (N=479)	
Yes	8.1%
No	74.9%
Don't know	13.6%
Not applicable	3.3%

Q31. Supports included in the IEP to assist student(s) participating in extra-curricular activities with students w/o disabilities

Independent w/o supports (N=761)	
Yes	58.9%
No	35.1%
Don't know	4.5%
Not applicable	1.6%

Peer supports (N=700)	
Yes	11.0%
No	81.7%
Don't know	5.4%
Not applicable	1.9%

Staff support (N=701)	
Yes	18.0%
No	75.5%
Don't know	4.9%
Not applicable	1.7%

Activity/materials modification	
Yes	23.6%
No	69.5%
Don't know	5.2%
Not applicable	1.7%

Other (N=610)	
Yes	5.1%
No	83.0%
Don't know	9.3%
Not applicable	2.6%

Not included in the IEP	
Yes	16.0%
No	69.6%
Don't know	8.7%
Not applicable	5.7%

Q32. Related services received during the 1996-1997 school year

Audiology (N=787)	
Yes	3.7%
No	86.4%
Don't know	1.7%
Not applicable	8.3%

Counseling services (N=790)	
Yes	14.4%
No	74.2%
Don't know	3.8%
Not applicable	7.6%

Medical services (N=789)	
Yes	6.2%
No	82.0%
Don't know	4.1%
Not applicable	7.7%

Occupational Therapy (N=788)	
Yes	4.1%
No	85.2%
Don't know	2.3%
Not applicable	8.5%

Parent counseling and training (N=789)	
Yes	2.5%
No	85.3%
Don't know	4.1%
Not applicable	8.1%

Physical Therapy (N=787)	
Yes	3.7%
No	85.0%
Don't know	2.0%
Not applicable	9.3%

Psychological services (N=789)	
Yes	5.3%
No	81.6%
Don't know	4.4%
Not applicable	8.6%

Therapeutic recreation (N=786)	
Yes	1.7%
No	86.4%
Don't know	3.1%
Not applicable	8.9%

Social work services (N=788)	
Yes	1.0%
No	86.5%
Don't know	3.8%
Not applicable	8.6%

Speech pathology (N=791)	
Yes	9.5%
No	79.8%
Don't know	1.9%
Not applicable	8.8%

Adaptive and assistive technology (N=790)	
Yes	8.6%
No	80.3%
Don't know	2.3%
Not applicable	8.9%

Art therapy (N=790)	
Yes	1.1%
No	86.7%
Don't know	2.5%
Not applicable	9.6%

Corrective therapy (N=789)	
Yes	0.3%
No	87.3%
Don't know	2.9%
Not applicable	9.5%

Music therapy (N=789)	
Yes	0.8%
No	86.6%
Don't know	3.0%
Not applicable	9.6%

Orientation and mobility training (N=789)	
Yes	2.8%
No	85.6%
Don't know	1.8%
Not applicable	9.9%

School health services (N=791)	
Yes	7.7%
No	80.9%
Don't know	2.8%
Not applicable	8.6%

Visual training therapy (N=790)	
Yes	1.5%
No	86.6%
Don't know	1.9%
Not applicable	10.0%

Braille training (N=789)	
Yes	1.3%
No	87.3%
Don't know	1.1%
Not applicable	10.3%

Recreation Therapy (N=790)	
Yes	2.2%
No	85.8%
Don't know	2.3%
Not applicable	9.7%

Transportation (N=792)	
Yes	16.2%
No	74.4%
Don't know	1.5%
Not applicable	8.0%

Rehabilitation Counseling (N=792)	
Yes	3.8%
No	83.6%
Don't know	3.7%
Not applicable	9.0%

Integrated/supported employment (n=790)	
Yes	6.7%
No	83.3%
Don't know	1.9%
Not applicable	8.1%

Education (continuing/post/adult) (N=791)	
Yes	7.3%
No	82.7%
Don't know	2.1%
Not applicable	7.8%

Adult services (N=789)	
Yes	3.4%
No	85.8%
Don't know	2.4%
Not applicable	8.4%

Independent living (N=790)	
Yes	5.8%
No	83.7%
Don't know	2.0%
Not applicable	8.5%

Community participation (N=790)	
Yes	7.8%
No	81.5%
Don't know	2.4%
Not applicable	8.2%

Other (N=657)	
Yes	2.4%
No	80.5%
Don't know	4.4%
Not applicable	12.6%

Q33. IEP addressed issues of self-determination as the following

Goals (N=803)	
Yes	34.6%
No	58.9%
Don't know	5.4%
Not applicable	1.1%

Objectives (N=803)	
Yes	34.4%
No	58.8%
Don't know	5.7%
Not applicable	1.1%

Activities (N=802)	
Yes	30.8%
No	61.8%
Don't know	6.2%
Not applicable	1.1%

Q34. IEP includes portions of the ITP identified as responsibility of the district? (N=803)

Yes	85.7%
No	7.7%
Don't know	2.4%
Not applicable	4.2%

Q35. Based on ARD Committee decision, the IEP includes rationale for not including instruction toward transition (N=799)

Yes	28.2%
No	19.9%
Don't know	4.0%
Not applicable	47.9%

Q36. Based on ARD Committee decision, the IEP includes rationale for not including community experiences toward transition (N=801)

Yes	30.6%
No	27.7%
Don't know	4.1%
Not applicable	37.6%

Q37. Based on ARD Committee decision, the IEP includes rationale for not including development of employment or other post-school living objectives toward transition (N=801)

Yes	29.6%
No	22.8%
Don't know	4.4%
Not applicable	43.2%

Q38. Student has a written ITP for the 1996-1997 school year (N=797)

Yes	89.2%
No	10.2%
Not applicable	0.6%

Q39. Source of transition services

Public Education (N=486)	
Yes	93.4%
No	2.1%
Don't know	2.1%
Not applicable	2.5%

Community agency (N=126)	
Yes	81.0%
No	8.7%
Don't know	1.6%
Not applicable	8.7%

Both public educ & comm. Agency (N=291)	
Yes	92.1%
No	1.4%
Don't know	2.7%
Not applicable	3.8%

Transition Services (N=84)	
Yes	69.0%
No	13.1%
Don't know	2.4%
Not applicable	15.5%

Q40. Outcome areas addressed on the 1996-1997 ITP

Post-secondary education (N=764)	
Yes	84.9%
No	10.7%
Don't know	2.9%
Not applicable	1.4%

Employment (N=769)	
Yes	89.1%
No	6.6%
Don't know	2.9%
Not applicable	1.4%

Recreation/Social/Leisure (N=766)	
Yes	82.2%
No	13.3%
Don't know	3.0%
Not applicable	1.4%

Independnet living options (N=766)	
Yes	82.5%
No	12.8%
Don't know	3.3%
Not applicable	1.4%

General considerations (N=761)	
Yes	74.0%
No	20.4%
Don't know	4.2%
Not applicable	1.4%

Adult education (N=748)	
Yes	49.7%
No	44.1%
Don't know	4.7%
Not applicable	1.5%

Other (N=440)	
Yes	18.6%
No	58.8%
Don't know	12.7%
Not applicable	3.2%

Q41. Student needs identified per 1996-1997 IT

Q42. Services provided according to the 1996-1997 ITP

	Identified Needs (N=760)	Services Provided (N=753)
Vocational assessment		
Yes	22.5%	19.8%
No	71.8%	71.0%
Don't know	3.9%	7.0%
Not applicable	1.7%	2.1%

	Identified Needs (N=769)	Services Provided (N=764)
Career Counseling/School Guidance		
Yes	43.3%	46.9%
No	51.4%	45.3%
Don't know	3.8%	6.2%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.7%

Rehabilitation Counbseling

	(N=753)	(N=750)
Yes	18.9%	13.4%
No	75.0%	77.1%
Don't know	4.5%	7.6%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.7%

Comm. based training/work experience

	(N=757)	(N=749)
Yes	34.1%	32.3%
No	60.9%	60.9%
Don't know	3.3%	5.2%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Ongoing employment support

	(N=756)	(N=751)
Yes	28.7%	26.2%
No	66.1%	66.7%
Don't know	3.6%	5.5%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Ind. & comm. living/recreation

	(N=757)	(N=749)
Yes	35.8%	27.0%
No	59.2%	65.6%
Don't know	3.4%	5.9%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Soc skills training/support

	(N=756)	(N=749)
Yes	14.9%	18.0%
No	80.0%	75.3%
Don't know	3.4%	5.1%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Residential support services

	(N=755)	(N=747)
Yes	9.7%	4.4%
No	85.0%	87.7%
Don't know	3.7%	6.3%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Case management

	(N=755)	(N=748)
Yes	10.7%	11.4%
No	82.9%	80.7%
Don't know	4.8%	6.3%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Medical assistance/therapy

	(N=761)	(N=750)
Yes	10.1%	6.9%
No	84.5%	85.2%
Don't know	3.8%	6.3%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Attendant services

	(N=755)	(N=747)
Yes	2.4%	1.2%
No	91.5%	90.2%
Don't know	4.5%	6.8%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.7%

Individual/family support

	(N=755)	(N=748)
Yes	15.9%	13.0%
No	78.7%	79.0%
Don't know	3.8%	6.4%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Career/vocational education classes

	(N=764)	(N=759)
Yes	52.6%	51.0%
No	43.1%	42.3%
Don't know	2.7%	5.1%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Job placement

	(N=768)	(N=757)
Yes	31.5%	23.6%
No	62.9%	67.9%
Don't know	4.0%	6.9%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Academic instruction

	(N=764)	(N=763)
Yes	72.6%	76.1%
No	23.2%	18.2%
Don't know	2.6%	4.1%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Self-Advocacy & Self-det. training

	(N=757)	(N=749)
Yes	12.9%	12.1%
No	81.6%	80.5%
Don't know	3.8%	5.7%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Income assistance

	(N=757)	(N=749)
Yes	19.2%	11.5%
No	73.4%	76.9%
Don't know	5.8%	10.0%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Transportation

	(N=765)	(N=757)
Yes	29.8%	23.5%
No	65.8%	69.5%
Don't know	2.9%	5.4%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Guardianship

	(N=756)	(N=750)
Yes	10.2%	5.3%
No	84.7%	85.9%
Don't know	3.6%	7.2%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Assistive/adaptive devices

	(N=756)	(N=747)
Yes	6.3%	6.2%
No	88.8%	86.1%
Don't know	3.3%	6.0%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.7%

Financial planning

	(N=753)	(N=745)
Yes	9.4%	6.2%
No	84.2%	85.1%
Don't know	4.8%	7.1%
Not applicable	1.6%	1.6%

Other

	(N=553)	(N=574)
Yes	9.6%	6.4%
No	78.3%	78.6%
Don't know	9.9%	12.9%
Not applicable	2.2%	2.1%

Q43. Individuals who attended the student's last ITP meeting

	Yes	No	Don't know	Not applicable
Student (N=773)	83.1%	13.3%	2.5%	1.2%
Parent/guardian (N=757)	58.3%	38.0%	2.4%	1.3%
Gen. Educ. classroom teacher (N=719)	24.1%	71.3%	2.9%	1.7%
Gen. Voc. Educ. Representative (N=718)	19.5%	75.6%	3.2%	1.7%
Spec. Educ. classroom teacher (N=768)	82.0%	14.2%	2.5%	1.3%
Diangostician (N=756)	49.6%	46.7%	2.4%	1.3%
School Transition Coordinator (N=722)	36.1%	59.1%	3.0%	1.4%
Voc. Adjustment coordinator (N=742)	39.2%	56.9%	2.6%	1.3%
School supv/administrator (N=751)	50.7%	45.3%	2.7%	1.3%
Advocate (N=720)	4.3%	91.4%	2.9%	1.4%
Adult service agency rep. (N=732)	25.0%	71.0%	2.6%	1.4%
Other service provider (N=737)	19.9%	75.6%	3.1%	1.4%
Spec. voc. Educ. rep. (N=708)	7.9%	86.6%	4.1%	1.4%

Q44. Service providers invited to attend the last ITP meeting.
Q45. Service providers who attended the last ITP meeting

	Invited	Attended
Home school district	(N=778)	(N=779)
Yes	77.8%	79.1%
No	11.6%	16.8%
Don't know	8.9%	2.3%
Not applicable	1.8%	1.8%
Texas Workforce Commission	(N=762)	(N=762)
Yes	5.4%	3.1%
No	77.6%	91.3%
Don't know	15.7%	4.2%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Texas Dept. of Human Services	(N=761)	(N=762)
Yes	4.2%	0.1%
No	79.4%	94.4%
Don't know	15.1%	4.2%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Texas Commission for the Deaf	(N=762)	(N=762)
Yes	0.4%	0.4%
No	83.5%	94.2%
Don't know	14.7%	4.1%
Not applicable	1.4%	1.3%
Tx Dept. MHMR	(N=763)	(N=763)
Yes	6.9%	4.5%
No	77.1%	90.2%
Don't know	14.7%	4.1%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Independnet Living Center	(N=761)	(N=762)
Yes	0.5%	0.1%
No	83.7%	94.2%
Don't know	14.5%	4.3%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Local Workforce Development Board rep	(N=761)	(N=762)
Yes	0.3%	0.1%
No	83.6%	93.8%
Don't know	14.8%	4.7%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%

	Invited	Attended
Texas Rehabilitation Commission	(N=773)	(N=771)
Yes	52.3%	25.4%
No	31.6%	70.2%
Don't know	14.9%	3.1%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Texas Dept. of Health	(N=761)	(N=762)
Yes	2.6%	0.1%
No	80.9%	94.5%
Don't know	15.1%	4.1%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Texas Commission for the Blind	(N=761)	(N=762)
Yes	2.1%	2.2%
No	81.7%	92.4%
Don't know	14.7%	4.1%
Not applicable	1.4%	1.3%
Tx Dept. of Protective and Regulatory Service	(N=761)	(N=761)
Yes	3.5%	1.7%
No	79.9%	92.8%
Don't know	15.1%	4.2%
Not applicable	1.4%	1.3%
Local MHMR Center	(N=763)	(N=762)
Yes	5.6%	2.2%
No	78.9%	92.4%
Don't know	14.2%	4.1%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	(N=761)	(N=762)
Yes	2.9%	1.7%
No	80.9%	92.5%
Don't know	14.8%	4.5%
Not applicable	1.3%	1.3%
Other adult agency rep	(N=758)	(N=761)
Yes	5.7%	2.0%
No	78.2%	91.7%
Don't know	14.6%	4.9%
Not applicable	1.5%	1.4%

Other community service provider	(N=760)	(N=761)	Private provider of adult services	(N=752)	(N=753)
Yes	5.7%	4.6%	Yes	1.6%	0.4%
No	78.2%	89.1%	No	81.5%	92.4%
Don't know	14.7%	4.9%	Don't know	15.4%	5.7%
Not applicable	1.4%	1.4%	Not applicable	1.5%	1.5%

Q46. Services indicated that the student will need upon graduation in the category of employment

Vocational assessment (N=755)		Rehabilitation Counseling (N=761)	
Yes	16.3%	Yes	22.9%
No	73.1%	No	65.6%
Don't know	9.4%	Don't know	10.4%
Not applicable	1.2%	Not applicable	1.2%
Career/voc. education classes (N=754)		Community work experience (N=751)	
Yes	29.2%	Yes	27.4%
No	59.3%	No	60.6%
Don't know	10.3%	Don't know	10.8%
Not applicable	1.2%	Not applicable	1.2%
Job placement (N=756)		Ongoing employment support (N=754)	
Yes	31.3%	Yes	26.7%
No	56.6%	No	61.7%
Don't know	10.8%	Don't know	10.5%
Not applicable	1.2%	Not applicable	1.2%
Other (N=542)			
Yes	5.5%		
No	72.1%		
Don't know	20.7%		
Not applicable	1.7%		

Q47. Services indicated that the student will need upon graduation in the category of postsecondary education services.

Study skills support (N=762)		Academic coursework (N=760)	
Yes	22.7%	Yes	34.3%
No	66.0%	No	54.2%
Don't know	10.1%	Don't know	10.3%
Not applicable	1.2%	Not applicable	1.2%
Career counseling/school guidance (N=757)		Financial assistance (N=756)	
Yes	29.5%	Yes	19.7%
No	59.0%	No	63.9%
Don't know	10.3%	Don't know	15.2%
Not applicable	1.2%	Not applicable	1.2%
Transportation (N=754)		Other (N=539)	
Yes	15.8%	Yes	2.8%
No	70.6%	No	75.1%
Don't know	12.5%	Don't know	20.4%
Not applicable	1.2%	Not applicable	1.7%

Q48. Services indicated that the student will need upon graduation in the category of recreation/social/leisure

Recreation/leisure services (N=760)		Social supports (N=756)	
Yes	19.2%	Yes	15.7%
No	70.4%	No	72.6%
Don't know	9.1%	Don't know	10.3%
Not applicable	1.3%	Not applicable	1.3%
Other (N=582))			
Yes	2.4%		
No	77.3%		
Don't know	18.4%		
Not applicable	1.7%		

Q49. Services indicated that the student will need upon graduation in the category of Independnet Living

Independnet living skills training (N=760)		Residential services and supports (N=755)	
Yes	21.2%	Yes	11.7%
No	68.4%	No	77.2%
Don't know	9.1%	Don't know	9.8%
Not applicable	1.3%	Not applicable	1.3%

In-home and family support (N=755)	
Yes	15.9%
No	72.6%
Don't know	10.2%
Not applicable	1.3%

Respite care (N=752)	
Yes	2.7%
No	85.0%
Don't know	11.0%
Not applicable	1.3%

Other (N=554)	
Yes	1.6%
No	78.7%
Don't know	17.9%
Not applicable	1.8%

Q50. Services indicated that the student will need upon graduation in the category of general services.

Self-advocacy training (N=771)	
Yes	9.3%
No	78.1%
Don't know	11.3%
Not applicable	1.3%

Income assistance (N=771)	
Yes	20.9%
No	63.3%
Don't know	14.5%
Not applicable	1.3%

Transportation (N=774)	
Yes	22.2%
No	65.5%
Don't know	11.0%
Not applicable	1.3%

Case management/coordination (N=767)	
Yes	13.2%
No	74.1%
Don't know	11.5%
Not applicable	1.3%

Guardianship (N=766)	
Yes	9.9%
No	79.0%
Don't know	9.8%
Not applicable	1.3%

Assistive/adaptive devices (N=765)	
Yes	8.4%
No	80.9%
Don't know	9.4%
Not applicable	1.3%

Personal assistant services (N=766)	
Yes	4.0%
No	83.9%
Don't know	10.7%
Not applicable	1.3%

Financial services (N=763)	
Yes	12.1%
No	74.4%
Don't know	12.2%
Not applicable	1.3%

Other (N=543)	
Yes	1.3%
No	77.3%
Don't know	19.5%
Not applicable	1.8%

Q51. Student expectation for employment according to ITP (N=756)

Competitive employment	70.6%
Supported employment	14.2%
Sheltered employment	5.4%
Vocational training	4.0%
Other	5.8%

Q52. Student expectation for vocational training according to ITP (N=759)

Vocational rehabilitation	22.5%
JTPA	3.4%
MHMR	7.2%
Tx Commission for the Blind	3.2%
Other	29.4%
Not addressed in the ITP	34.3%

Q53. Student expectation for postsecondary education according to ITP (N=820)

Community College	25.7%
Junior College	7.6%
University/College (4 year)	11.0%
Business School	1.3%
Trade/technical school (proprietary)	13.9%
Military training	3.8%
Adult basic education/GED	1.1%
Other	24.3%
Not addressed in the ITP	11.3%

Q54. Student expectation for long term living arrangement according to ITP (N=762)

Live w/family members	18.4%
Live alone /roommate(s) w/o support	61.9%
Live alone/roommate(s) w/support	4.5%
Supervised living	7.7%
Other	2.5%
Not addressed in the ITP	5.0%

Q55. Student expectation for recreation/leisure according to ITP (N=764)

Community rec/leisure activities	6.5%
Independnet rec/leisure activities	72.8%
Specialized rec. programs/disabilities	8.9%
Day programs/disabilities	2.7%
Other	3.1%
Not addressed in the ITP	5.9%

Q56. Does the ITP include instruction? (N=776)

Yes	88.0%
No	8.5%
Don't know	2.1%
Not applicable	1.4%

Q57. Does ITP include community experiences? (N=774)

Yes	62.4%
No	34.0%
Don't know	2.2%
Not applicable	1.4%

Q58. Does ITP include employment or other post-school living objectives? (N=774)

Yes	77.5%
No	19.1%
Don't know	1.9%
Not applicable	1.4%

Q59. Does ITP include recommendation for functional vocational evaluation? (N=775)

Yes	44.4%
No	48.9%
Don't know	4.3%
Not applicable	2.5%

Q60. Does ITP include functional vocational evaluation if it was recommended? (N=671)

Yes	24.9%
No	37.6%
Don't know	9.4%
Not applicable	28.2%

Q61. Does ITP indicate responbsibiliti for each aspect of the plan? (N=776)

Yes	86.5%
No	9.8%
Don't know	2.3%
Not applicable	1.4%

Q62. Is the ITP developed in a separate document from the IEP? (N=775)

Yes	93.3%
No	3.5%
Don't know	1.8%
Not applicable	1.4%

Q63. Does ITP identify when/how support services will be provided? (N=776)

Yes	77.8%
No	15.9%
Don't know	4.9%
Not applicable	1.4%

Q64. Does ITP identify timelines with projected beginning and ending dates? (N=776)

Yes	79.8%
No	16.2%
Don't know	2.6%
Not applicable	1.4%

Q65. Is the ITP developed apart and before the IEP? (N=776)

Yes	90.1%
No	6.1%
Don't know	2.4%
Not applicable	1.4%

Appendix 3: Data Collection Instrument

Texas Special Education Effectiveness Study
Student Record Review
Summer 1997

District Information	
School District	
County-District Number	
Campus	
Complete Address	
Phone Number	
Data Collector Information	
Record Review Completed by	
Title	
Address	
Phone Number	
Student Information	
Name(last, middle first, other)	
Complete Address	
Phone Number	
Family Contact	
Relation to Student	
Complete Address	
Phone Number	
Student's DOB(MMDDYY)	
Age (as of June 1, 1996)	
Social Security Number	
Student ID Number (if SS# not known)	
Gender(1=Male 2=Female)	
Grade Level	

1

1. How many total years has this student been receiving special education services?	
Enter number of years -->	

2. Ethnicity	Circle one choice.
1-American Indian or Alaskan Native	
2-Asian or Pacific Islander	
3-Black, not of Hispanic origin	
4-Hispanic	
5-White, not of Hispanic origin	

3. Primary Disability	Circle one choice.
1-orthopedic impairment	
2-other health impairment	
3-auditory impairment	
4-visual impairment	
5-deaf/blind	
6-mental retardation	
7-emotional disturbance	
8-specific learning disability	
9-speech impairment	
10-autism	
11-developmental delay	
12-traumatic brain injury	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. If the primary disability of the student is mental retardation, indicate the level of disability. (Circle one choice)
1-mild
2-moderate
3-severe
4-profound

5. Enter available absentee information for this student's last four years of school.

School Year	Number of Days Absent	or	Number of Classes Absent
1996-97			
1995-96			
1994-95			
1993-94			

6. Indicate if this student is eligible for the following programs. (Circle one choice)
1-Free meals
2-Reduced price meals
3-Other economic disadvantaged
4-Not identified as economically disadvantaged

7. Indicate this student's primary means of communication. (Circle one choice)
1-American Sign Language (ASL)
2-English
3-Spanish
4-Vietnamese
5-Student is nonverbal and uses adaptive technology (Specify:)
6-Student is nonverbal
7-Other (Specify:)

8. Indicate means of exiting high school. (Circle one choice)
1-Regular graduation (completed minimum academic credit requirements applicable to students in regular education including satisfactory performance on the exit level assessment instruments)
2-Completion of IEP requirements including minimum credit requirements resulting in full time employment, or demonstrated mastery of specific employability and self help skills, or
3-Completion of IEP requirements and access to services, employment, or education options outside of public education
4-Completion of IEP requirements and no longer meets age eligibility requirements
5-Completion of IEP requirements including minimum credit requirements that result in full time employment in addition to sufficient self help skills to enable the student to maintain employment without public school services
6-Drop out
7-Student did not graduated during the 1996-1997 school year

9. Indicate this student's primary instructional arrangement for the 1996-1997 school year. (Circle one choice)
1-Regular Classroom
2-Resource room/service
3-Self-contained, mild and moderate, regular campus
4-Self-contained, severe and profound, regular campus
5-Self-contained, separate campus
6-Vocational Adjustment Class
7-Homebound
8-Hospital Class
9-Nonpublic Day School
10-Residential Care and Treatment Facility
11-State School (for persons with mental retardation)
12-Community Class
13-Texas School for the Deaf
14-Texas School for the Blind and Visually Impaired
15-Other (Specify:)

10. Indicate the response that most closely corresponds to the number of hours per week that this student spends in regular educational settings (excluding lunch) with peers without disabilities. (Circle one choice)
1-less than one hour per week
2-one to five hours per week
3-six to ten hours per week
4-eleven to fifteen hours per week
5-sixteen to twenty hours per week
6-twenty one to twenty five hours per week
7-twenty six to thirty hours per week

11. Indicate the response that most closely corresponds to the number of hours per week that this student spends in special educational settings (excluding lunch) with peers who have disabilities. (Circle one choice)
1-less than one hour per week
2-one to five hours per week
3-six to ten hours per week
4-eleven to fifteen hours per week
5-sixteen to twenty hours per week
6-twenty one to twenty five hours per week
7-twenty six to thirty hours per week

12. Indicate the percentage of this student's school day engaged in the following activities (do not include after school employment)	
a. School-based work experience	%
b. Community-based work experience	%

13. Estimate the percentage of time during the school year that this student spent in each study area	Percent of time
Academics (e.g.,language arts, math, social studies, science)	
Life Skills (e.g., money management, hygiene, homemaking skills, community access)	
General Vocational Skills	
Occupational exploration	
Specific Vocational Skills (e.g., office skills, auto body, food service, cosmetology) A. B. C.	
Physical Education	
Arts (e.g., music, art theatre)	
Services Disability Support (circle all that apply) A. physical therapy or mobility training B. Mental Health or Social Work Services (personal/group counseling or therapy) C. Speech Therapy D. Communication services for hearing or visual impairments (e.g., sign language, braille) E. Other (specify:)	
Other (specify:)	
	100%

14. Indicate the date of the last intellectual assessment on this student. (MMDDYY) -->	

15. Indicate the name of the test administered. (Circle one choice)
1-WISC-R
2-WAIS-R
3-Kaufman ABC
4-Stanford-Binet
5-TONI
6-Other (specify:)

16. Enter this student's most recent IQ scores		
a.	Verbal IQ -->	
b.	Performance IQ -->	
c.	Full scale IQ -->	

17. Indicate the name of the most recent developmental scale administered. -->	
18. Enter the most recent developmental quotient for this student (if applicable). -->	

19. Did this student take the TAAS test during its last administration?	YES	NO
20. If this student took the TAAS test indicate whether this student mastered the following TAAS components.		
a. Language Arts	YES	NO
b. Mathematics	YES	NO
c. Writing	YES	NO
21. Did this student require modifications in order to take the TAAS test?	YES	NO

22. Enter the name of any alternative assessment administered.	
Name of assessment	
Date administered	
How are results reported?	

23. Indicate the name, level, form and date of the most recent norm-referenced achievement test administered to this student		
Name of achievement test	-->	
Form of test	-->	
Level of test	-->	
Date administered	-->	

24. Enter information on the most recent vocational assessment(s) this student received.		
	Type of vocational assessment	Date assessment was administered
Vocational Interest 1) 2)		
Vocational Aptitude 1) 2)		
Exploratory vocational experiences		
Work Samples		
Situational Assessment		
Observations		
Interviews		
Other		

25. Did results of the vocational assessment(s) result in one or more of the following recommendations?	
Enrollment in specific instructional area (i.e., agriculture, health occupations, etc)	Yes No
Enrollment in a specific vocational program (i.e., VAC, VEH, CVAE)	Yes No
Development of IEP objectives	Yes No
Other (specify_____)	Yes No

26. Indicate the family member who attended the last ARD meeting. (Circle all that apply)	
1-Mother	
2-Father	
3-Both parents	
4-Foster parents or other guardian	
5-Surrogate parent	
6-No one from the family attended	
7-Other (specify)	
27. Did the student attend his or her ARD meeting?	Yes No

KEY: Y=yes, N=no, D=don't know, NA=not applicable

28. Does the student's IEP include annual objectives developed from the ITP?	Y	N	D
29. Does the student's IEP include annual objectives developed from the ITP in each of the following areas?			
A. Post-secondary education	Y	N	D
B. Employment	Y	N	D
C. Recreation/Social/Leisure	Y	N	D
D. Independent Living (housing, adult responsibilities, support services, etc)	Y	N	D
E. General Considerations (income resources, medical services, transportation, etc.)	Y	N	D
F. Other Considerations (specify)	Y	N	D

30. Indicate whether each of the following transition services was addressed on the student's current IEP.			
A. Instruction	Y	N	D
B. Community experiences	Y	N	D
C. Employment	Y	N	D
D. Post-school adult living objectives	Y	N	D
E. If appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills	Y	N	D
F. Functional vocational evaluation	Y	N	D
G. Other (specify)	Y	N	D

31. Indicate whether each of the following supports was indicated on the IEP, to assist the student in participating in extra-curricular activities with students who do not have disabilities.			
A. Independent (student participates w/o supports)	Y	N	D
B. Peer supports (e.g., buddy system)	Y	N	D
C. Staff support (e.g., educational aide)	Y	N	D
D. Activity/materials modification	Y	N	D
E. Other (specify)	Y	N	D
F. Not included in the IEP	Y	N	D

32. Indicate whether the student has received any of the following related services during the 1996-1997 school year.				
A. Audiology	Y	N	D	NA
B. Counseling services	Y	N	D	NA
C. Medical services	Y	N	D	NA
D. Occupational therapy	Y	N	D	NA
E. Parent counseling and training	Y	N	D	NA
F. Physical therapy	Y	N	D	NA
G. Psychological services	Y	N	D	NA
H. Therapeutic recreation	Y	N	D	NA
I. Social work services in schools	Y	N	D	NA
J. Speech pathology(not instructional arrangement)	Y	N	D	NA
K. Adaptive and assistive technology	Y	N	D	NA
L. Art therapy	Y	N	D	NA
M. Corrective therapy	Y	N	D	NA
N. Music therapy	Y	N	D	NA
O. Orientation and mobility training	Y	N	D	NA
P. School health services	Y	N	D	NA
Q. Visual training therapy (not by VI teacher)	Y	N	D	NA
R. Braille training	Y	N	D	NA
S. Recreation therapy	Y	N	D	NA
T. Transportation	Y	N	D	NA
U. Rehabilitation counseling	Y	N	D	NA
V. Integrated/supported employment	Y	N	D	NA
W. Education (continuing/post/adult)	Y	N	D	NA
X. Adult services	Y	N	D	NA
Y. Independent living	Y	N	D	NA
Z. Community participation	Y	N	D	NA
AA. Other (specify)	Y	N	D	NA

33. Indicate if the student's IEP addresses issues of self-determination (self-empowerment, self-advocacy, etc.) at each of the following levels.			
A. Goals	Y	N	D
B. Objectives	Y	N	D
C. Activities	Y	N	D

Please indicate the appropriate response to the following questions based on this student's IEP.				
34. Does the IEP incorporate those portions of the ITP which are the responsibility of the school district?	Y	N	D	NA
35. If the ARD committee determined that instruction toward transition is not to be included in the IEP, does the IEP say so, and explain the basis for that decision?	Y	N	D	NA
36. If the ARD committee determined that community experiences are not to be included in the IEP, does the IEP say so, and explain the basis for that decision?	Y	N	D	NA
37. If the ARD committee determined that the development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives are not to be included in the IEP, does the IEP say so, and explain the basis for that decision?	Y	N	D	NA

Please use the student's ITP to answer all of the remaining questions.

KEY: Y=yes, N=no, D=don't know, NA=not applicable

Enter information about this student's Individual Transition Plan (ITP)		
38. Does this student have a written ITP for the 1996-1997 school year?	Yes	No

39. Indicate the response that best describes the source of transition services for this student according to his or her ITP. (Circle all that apply)
A. Public Education
B. Community agency (other than public education)
C. Both public education and community agency.
D. Student (did)does not receive transition services.

40. Indicate whether each of the following outcome areas was addressed on the student's 1996-1997 ITP.			
A. Post-secondary education (specific training)	Y	N	D
B. Employment	Y	N	D
C. Recreation/Social/Leisure	Y	N	D
D. Independent living options (Housing, support services)	Y	N	D
E. General Considerations (Income resources, medical services, transportation)	Y	N	D
F. Adult education (general learning)	Y	N	D
G. Other (specify:)	Y	N	D

41. Indicate whether each of the following services were identified as needs according to the student's 1996-1997 ITP.			
A. Vocational Assessment	Y	N	D
B. Career Counseling/School Guidance	Y	N	D
C. Rehabilitation Counseling	Y	N	D
D. Career/vocational education classes	Y	N	D
E. Community based training/work experience	Y	N	D
F. Job Placement	Y	N	D
G. Ongoing employment support	Y	N	D
H. Academic instruction	Y	N	D
I. Independent and community living/recreation	Y	N	D
J. Self-Advocacy/Self-Determination training	Y	N	D
K. Social skills training/support	Y	N	D
L. Income assistance (SSI, PASS, etc.)	Y	N	D
M. Residential support services	Y	N	D
N. Transportation	Y	N	D
O. Case management and coordination	Y	N	D
P. Guardianship	Y	N	D
Q. Medical assistance/therapy	Y	N	D
R. Assistive/adaptive deceives (specify)	Y	N	D
S. Attendant services	Y	N	D
T. Financial planning	Y	N	D
U. Individual and family support services	Y	N	D
V. Other (specify)	Y	N	D

42. Indicate whether each of the following services were provided to the student according to the student's 1996-1997 ITP.			
A. Vocational Assessment	Y	N	D
B. Career Counseling/School Guidance	Y	N	D
C. Rehabilitation Counseling	Y	N	D
D. Career/vocational education classes	Y	N	D
E. Community based training/work experience	Y	N	D
F. Job Placement	Y	N	D
G. Ongoing employment support	Y	N	D
H. Academic instruction	Y	N	D
I. Independent and community living/recreation	Y	N	D
J. Self-Advocacy/Self-Determination training	Y	N	D
K. Social skills training/support	Y	N	D
L. Income assistance (SSI, PASS, etc.)	Y	N	D
M. Residential support services	Y	N	D
N. Transportation	Y	N	D
O. Case management and coordination	Y	N	D
P. Guardianship	Y	N	D
Q. Medical assistance/therapy	Y	N	D
R. Assistive/adaptive deceives (specify)	Y	N	D
S. Attendant services	Y	N	D
T. Financial planning	Y	N	D
U. Individual and family support services	Y	N	D
V. Other (specify)	Y	N	D

43. For each item, indicate whether or not that individual attended the student's last ITP meeting.			
A. Student	Y	N	D
B. Parent or Guardian	Y	N	D
C. General education classroom teacher	Y	N	D
D. General vocational education representative	Y	N	D
E. Special education classroom teacher	Y	N	D
F. Diagnostician	Y	N	D
G. School transition coordinator	Y	N	D
H. Vocational Adjustment Coordinator (VAC)	Y	N	D
I. School supervisor/administrator	Y	N	D
J. Advocate	Y	N	D
K. Adult service agency representatives	Y	N	D
L. Other service providers	Y	N	D
M. Special vocational education representative	Y	N	D

44. Indicate whether the following service providers were invited to attend the student's last ITP meeting.			
A. Home School District	Y	N	D
B. Texas Rehabilitation Commission (TRC)	Y	N	D
C. Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)	Y	N	D
D. Texas Department of Health (TDH)	Y	N	D
E. Texas Department of Human Services (DHS)	Y	N	D
F. Texas Commission for the Blind (TCB)	Y	N	D
G. Texas Commission for the Deaf (TCD)	Y	N	D
H. Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Service	Y	N	D
I. TX Dept. Of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (TxMHMR)	Y	N	D
J. Local Mental Health/Mental Retardation center	Y	N	D
K. Independent Living Center (ILC)	Y	N	D
L. Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	Y	N	D
M. Local Workforce Development Board Representative	Y	N	D
N. Other adult agency representative (specify)	Y	N	D
O. Other community service provider (specify)	Y	N	D
P. Private provider (specify)	Y	N	D

45. Indicate whether the following service providers attended the student's last ITP meeting.			
A. Home School District	Y	N	D
B. Texas Rehabilitation Commission (TRC)	Y	N	D
C. Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)	Y	N	D
D. Texas Department of Health (TDH)	Y	N	D
E. Texas Department of Human Services (DHS)	Y	N	D
F. Texas Commission for the Blind (TCB)	Y	N	D
G. Texas Commission for the Deaf (TCD)	Y	N	D
H. Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Service	Y	N	D
I. TX Dept. Of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (TxMHMR)	Y	N	D
J. Local Mental Health/Mental Retardation center	Y	N	D
K. Independent Living Center (ILC)	Y	N	D
L. Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	Y	N	D
M. Local Workforce Development Board Representative	Y	N	D
N. Other adult agency representative (specify)	Y	N	D
O. Other community service provider (specify)	Y	N	D
P. Private provider (specify)	Y	N	D

Indicate which services the student will need upon graduation from high school in each of the following categories (questions 46-50).			
46. EMPLOYMENT			
A. Vocational Assessment	Y	N	D
B. Rehabilitation Counseling	Y	N	D
C. Career/vocational education class	Y	N	D
D. Community work experience	Y	N	D
E. Job Placement	Y	N	D
F. Ongoing employment support	Y	N	D
G. Other (specify)	Y	N	D
47. POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION SERVICES			
A. Study skills support	Y	N	D
B. Academic coursework	Y	N	D
C. Career counseling/school guidance	Y	N	D
D. Financial assistance	Y	N	D
E. Transportation	Y	N	D
F. Other (specify)	Y	N	D
48. RECREATION/SOCIAL/LEISURE			
A. Recreation/leisure services	Y	N	D
B. Social Supports	Y	N	D
C. Other (specify)	Y	N	D
49. INDEPENDENT LIVING			
A. Independent living skills training	Y	N	D
B. Residential services and supports	Y	N	D
C. In-home and family support	Y	N	D
D. Respite care	Y	N	D
E. Other (specify)	Y	N	D

50. GENERAL SERVICES			
A. Self-advocacy training	Y	N	D
B. Income assistance (SSI, rent subsidies, etc)	Y	N	D
C. Transportation	Y	N	D
D. Case management and coordination	Y	N	D
E. Guardianship	Y	N	D
F. Assistive/adaptive devices	Y	N	D
G. Personal assistant services	Y	N	D
H. Financial services	Y	N	D
I. Other (specify)	Y	N	D

51. Check (✓) the response that corresponds to the student's expectation for employment according to his or her ITP.	
	A. Competitive employment
	B. Supported employment
	C. Sheltered employment
	D. Vocational training
	E. Other (specify)

52. Check (✓) the response that corresponds to the student's expectation for vocational training according to his or her ITP.	
	A. Vocational rehabilitation
	B. Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)
	C. Mental Health/Mental Retardation (MHMR)
	D. Commission for the Blind (TCB)
	E. Other (specify)
	F. Not addressed in the ITP

53. Check (√) the response that corresponds to the student's expectation for post-secondary education according to his or her ITP.	
	A. Community College
	B. Junior College
	C. University/College (4 year)
	D. Business school
	E. Trade/technical school(proprietary school)
	F. Military training
	G. Adult basic education
	H. High School (GED classes)
	I. Other (specify)
	J. Not addressed in the ITP

54. Check (√) the response that corresponds to the student's expectation for long term living arrangement according to his or her ITP.	
	A. Will live with family members
	B. Will live alone or with roommate(s) without support
	C. Will live alone or roommate(s) with support
	D. Supervised living (group home, etc.)
	E. Other (specify)
	F. Not addressed in the ITP

55. Check (✓) the response that corresponds to the student's expectation for recreation/leisure according to his or her ITP.	
	A. Community recreation and leisure activities
	B. Independent recreation and leisure activities
	C. Specialized recreation programs for people with disabilities
	D. Day programs for people with disabilities who are unemployed
	E. Other (specify)
	F. Not addressed in the ITP

Please indicate the appropriate response to the following questions based on this student's ITP.			
56. Does the ITP include instruction?	Y	N	D
57. Does the ITP include community experiences?	Y	N	D
58. Does the ITP include the development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives?	Y	N	D
59. Does the ITP indicate whether or not it is appropriate to include a functional vocational evaluation in the plan?	Y	N	D
60. If a functional vocational evaluation is determined to be appropriate does the ITP include such an evaluation?	Y	N	D
61. Does the ITP indicate who is responsible for each aspect of the plan, including the parent, student, and adult/community agencies?	Y	N	D
62. Is the ITP developed in a document separate from the IEP?	Y	N	D
63. Does the ITP identify when and how support services will be provided?	Y	N	D
64. Does the ITP identify /timelines, with projected beginning and ending dates, for all transition activities?	Y	N	D
65. Is the ITP developed apart from and before the IEP is developed?	Y	N	D

Appendix 4: Community Type Descriptions

Community Type

Districts are classified on a scale raging from major urban to rural. Factors such as size, growth rates, student economic status, and proximity to urban areas are used to determine the appropriate group. Charters are in a separate category. The groups are:

- **Major Urban**
  The largest school districts in the state that serve the six metropolitan areas of Houston, Dallas, SanAntonio, Fort Worth, Austin, and El Paso. A district is designated major urban if the county population was greater than 650,000 it is the largest in the county and there are greater than 35% low-income students in the school district. Or, if not the largest district in the county, the number of students in membership is 75% of the largest and there are more than 35 % low-income students in the district.

- **Major Suburban**
  Other school districts in and around the major urban areas. A district is major suburban if it is contiguous to a major urban district and the number of students in membership is at least 3% of the major urban district. If a district is not contiguous to a major urban area, then an enrollment of 15% of the major urban district or an enrollment of at least 4,500 is required to be classified as a major suburban area.

- **Other Central City**
  The major school school districts in other large Texas cities. If the district is not contiguous to one of the major urban districts but the county population is between 100,000 and 650,000 and it is the largest district in the country or its population is 75% or the largest district then the district is designated as other central city.

- **Other Central City Suburban**
  Other school districts in and around the other large, but not major, Texas cities. If the district is in a county between 1000,000 and 650,000 population and the number of students in membership is as least 15% of the largest district in the county then it is designated central city suburban. If a district is contiguous to a central city district, its population is greater than 3% of that district's, and the number of students in membership is greater than the corresponding median figure for the state, it is also central city suburban.

- **Independent Town**
  If the district is the largest in a county having a population of 25,000 to 100,000, or the number of students in membership is greater than 75% of the largest district, the district is considered and independent town.

- **Non-Metro: Fast Growing**
  The school districts that fail to be in any of the above categories and that exhibit a five-year growth rate of at least 20 percent. These districts must have at least 300 students in membership.

- **Non-Metro: Stable**
  The school districts that fail to be in any of the above categories, yet the number in membership exceeds the state median.

- **Rural**
  The school districts that fail all of the above tests for placement into a category. These districts either have a growth rate less than 20 percent and the number of students in membership is between 300 and the state median, or the number of students in membership is less than 300.

- **Charter Schools**
  The 19 open-enrollment schools granted a charter by the State Board of Education for operation during 1997-98. Open enrollment charters operate in a facility of commercial or nonprofit entity or a school district.